

ASRS Database Report Set

General Aviation Flight Training Incidents

Report Set Description.....A sampling of reports referencing General Aviation flight training.

Update Number2.0

Date of UpdateJuly 27, 2000

Number of Records in Report Set50

Number of New Records in Report Set.....50

Type of Records in Report SetFor each update, new records received at ASRS will displace a like number of the oldest records in the Report Set, with the objective of providing the fifty most recent relevant ASRS Database records. Records within this Report Set have been screened to assure their relevance to the topic.

MEMORANDUM FOR: Recipients of Aviation Safety Reporting System Data
SUBJECT: Data Derived from ASRS Reports

The attached material is furnished pursuant to a request for data from the NASA Aviation Safety Reporting System (ASRS). Recipients of this material are reminded of the following points, which must be considered when evaluating these data.

ASRS reports are submitted voluntarily. The existence in the ASRS database of reports concerning a specific topic cannot, therefore, be used to infer the prevalence of that problem within the National Airspace System.

Reports submitted to ASRS may be amplified by further contact with the individual who submitted them, but the information provided by the reporter is not investigated further. Such information may or may not be correct in any or all respects. At best, it represents the perception of a specific individual who may or may not understand all of the factors involved in a given issue or event.

After preliminary processing, all ASRS reports are de-identified. Following de-identification, there is no way to identify the individual who submitted a report. All ASRS report processing systems are designed to protect identifying information submitted by reports, such as, names, company affiliations, and specific times of incident occurrence. There is, therefore, no way to verify information submitted in an ASRS report after it has been de-identified.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration and its ASRS contractor, Battelle Memorial Institute, specifically disclaim any responsibility for any interpretation which may be made by others of any material or data furnished by NASA in response to queries of the ASRS database and related materials.

Linda J. Connell, Director
Aviation Safety Reporting System

CAVEAT REGARDING STATISTICAL USE OF ASRS INFORMATION

Certain caveats apply to the use of ASRS statistical data. All ASRS reports are voluntarily submitted, and thus cannot be considered a measured random sample of the full population of like events. For example, we receive several thousand altitude deviation reports each year. This number may comprise over half of all the altitude deviations that occur, or it may be just a small fraction of total occurrences. We have no way of knowing which.

Moreover, not all pilots, controllers, air carriers, or other participants in the aviation system, are equally aware of the ASRS or equally willing to report to us. Thus, the data reflect **reporting biases**. These biases, which are not fully known or measurable, distort ASRS statistics. A safety problem such as near midair collisions (NMACs) may appear to be more highly concentrated in area "A" than area "B" simply because the airmen who operate in area "A" are more supportive of the ASRS program and more inclined to report to us should an NMAC occur.

Only one thing can be known for sure from ASRS statistics—they represent the **lower measure** of the true number of such events that are occurring. For example, if ASRS receives 300 reports of track deviations in 1993 (this number is purely hypothetical), then it can be known with certainty that at least 300 such events have occurred in 1993.

Because of these statistical limitations, we believe that the **real power** of ASRS lies in the **report narratives**. Here pilots, controllers, and others, tell us about aviation safety incidents and situations in detail. They explain what happened, and more importantly, **why** it happened. Using report narratives effectively requires an extra measure of study, the knowledge derived is well worth the added effort.

For text on the strengths and limitations of incident data, the process of using incidents for human factors evaluations, statistical analysis methods and other sources of incident data, see:

Chappell, S.L. (1994). Using voluntary incident reports for human factors evaluations. In N. Johnston, N. McDonald & R. Fuller (Eds.), *Aviation Psychology in Practice*. Aldershot, England: Ashgate.

ACN: 444711

Time

Date : 199907

Day : Wed

Local Time Of Day : 1201 To 1800

Place

State Reference : WA

Altitude.MSL.Bound Lower : 1800

Altitude.MSL.Bound Upper : 2000

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.TRACON : S46.TRACON

Make Model : Small Aircraft, Low Wing, 1 Eng, Retractable Gear

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 1580

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 115

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 18

ASRS Report : 444711

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Person / 3

Function.Controller : Approach

Events

Anomaly.Non Adherence : Clearance

Anomaly.Non Adherence : Published Procedure

Resolatory Action.Controller : Issued Advisory

Resolatory Action.None Taken : Anomaly Accepted

Resolatory Action.None Taken : Detected After The Fact

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

DURING A TRAINING FLT INVOLVING A PRACTICE INST APCH (ILS RWY 31L) TO BFI. OUR ACFT RECEIVED A FINAL RADAR VECTOR TO MAINTAIN 2000 FT UNTIL ESTABLISHED ON THE LOC COURSE AND CLRNC FOR THE APCH. DURING THIS PROCESS MY INST STUDENT WAS DEMONSTRATING HIS AUTOPLT TO ME, WE WERE CONDUCTING A COUPLED APCH. THIS WAS MY FIRST EXPOSURE TO USE OF AN AUTOPLT FOR A COUPLED APCH. AFTER THE ACFT WAS ESTABLISHED ON THE INBOUND COURSE, I REMINDED MY STUDENT THAT THE NEXT SEGMENT OF THE APCH ALLOWED FOR DSCNT TO 1800 FT. SO WE DID SO. HOWEVER, WE SHOULD HAVE WAITED UNTIL PASSING LACKR INTXN, A STEP-DOWN FIX SEVERAL MI OUTSIDE THE FAF, BEFORE DSNDRG TO 1800 FT. A FEW SECONDS AFTER LEVELING AT 1800 FT, THE APCH CTLR REPEATED INSTRUCTIONS TO MAINTAIN 2000 FT UNTIL ESTABLISHED ON COURSE. I REALIZED THEN WHAT HAD HAPPENED. JUST AS I WAS ABOUT TO HAVE US RETURN TO 2000 FT, WE ARRIVED AT LACKR INTXN. AT THE SAME TIME THE CTLR ASKED IF I HAD THE ARPT INSIGHT AT 12 O'CLOCK AND 9 MI. I DID (WX CONDITIONS WERE CAVU), AND WE RECEIVED INSTRUCTIONS TO THEN CONTACT BOEING TWR FOR LNDG CLRNC. CONTRIBUTING FACTORS HERE WERE OUR FIXATION WITH THE AUTOPLT SYS. EVEN DURING THIS FAMILIAR APCH OUR OVEREMPHASIS ON THE AUTOPLT SYS ALLOWED OMISSION OF SCANNING THE OTHER NAV INSTS. ALSO BECAUSE THE WX WAS EXCELLENT AND I HAD THE ARPT IN SIGHT, MY SCANNING DILIGENCE WAS, I BELIEVE, DEGRADED TO A LOWER LEVEL THAN HAD WE BEEN IN IMC. I HAVE EXPERIENCED THIS KIND OF DISTR RECENTLY AS AN INSTRUCTOR WHEREIN AN ACFT OWNER/PLT ENROLLS IN INST TRAINING. IT SEEMS THE AVERAGE ACFT OWNER HAS MORE SOPHISTICATED EQUIP ON BOARD THAN MANY (MOST?) INSTRUCTORS HAVE BEEN EXPOSED TO IN TRAINING ACFT. IN PARTICULAR, IFR CERTIFIED GPS UNITS AND AUTOPLTS ARE BEING ENCOUNTERED. IN MY EXPERIENCE, ACFT OWNER/INST STUDENT DOES NOT KNOW HOW TO PROFICIENTLY OPERATE THE GPS UNIT THEY HAVE AND CERTAINLY NEITHER DOES THE INSTRUCTOR. ALTHOUGH, PRIOR TO FLT, STUDENT AND INSTRUCTOR STUDY THE GPS MANUFACTURER'S VOLUMINOUS OPERATING MANUAL, THE FLT ITSELF IS WHERE BOTH STUDENT AND INSTRUCTOR GRAPPLE WITH THE TRIAL AND ERROR PROCESS OF SETTING UP THE GPS UNIT FOR EXECUTION OF PRACTICE INST APCHS. THE MOST SIGNIFICANT PROB I HAVE NOTED IS THAT I HAVE ALLOWED MYSELF TO BECOME ENGROSSED WITH PUSHING BUTTONS WHILE NOT KEEPING MY EYES SCANNING OUTSIDE FOR TFC. I HAVE CAUGHT MYSELF PREOCCUPIED IN THIS MANNER AND HAVE HAD TO REMIND MYSELF TO RESUME MY DUTY OF SCANNING OUTSIDE AND MAINTAIN SITUATIONAL AWARENESS. I HAVE BECOME AWARE OF HOW DISTRACTING TO THE UNINITIATED INSTRUCTOR A COMPLICATED NEW DEVICE CAN BE INFLT. FLT INSTRUCTORS NEED TO BE DOUBLY ALERT TO THE POWERFULLY DISTRACTING POTENTIAL IN THEIR MIDST WHILE PROVIDING TRAINING TO THEIR WELL-HEELED STUDENTS WHO BRING TO THE TABLE AMPLY-STOCKED COCKPIT PANELS.

Synopsis :

AN INSTRUCTOR AND STUDENT PLT DSNDRG BELOW THE PROC ALT ON APCH TO BOEING FIELD.

Time

Date : 199907

Day : Thu

Local Time Of Day : 1201 To 1800

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : TEB.Airport

State Reference : NJ

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 1500

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.Tower : TEB.Tower

Make Model : Falcon 10C

Aircraft / 2

Controlling Facilities.Tower : TEB.Tower

Make Model : Cessna Citation Undifferentiated or Other Model

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 14000

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 90

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 600

ASRS Report : 444863

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Person / 3

Function.Oversight : PIC

Function.Flight Crew : Captain

Person / 4

Function.Oversight : PIC

Function.Flight Crew : Captain

Person / 5

Function.Controller : Local

Events

Anomaly.Non Adherence : Clearance

Independent Detector.Other.ControllerA : 5

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewB : 2

Resolatory Action.Flight Crew : Became Reoriented

Resolatory Action.Flight Crew : Executed Go Around

Resolatory Action.Flight Crew : Took Precautionary Avoidance Action

Resolatory Action.Controller : Issued Advisory

Resolatory Action.Controller : Issued New Clearance

Resolatory Action.Controller : Provided Flight Assist

Supplementary

Problem Areas : ATC Human Performance

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

I WAS OPERATING A FALCON 10 AS AN INSTRUCTOR PLT, WITH 2 OTHER INSTRUCTORS FROM TETERBORO. WE WERE OPERATING ON AN IFR FLT PLAN FROM MJX TO TEB, AND WERE CLRED FOR THE VOR DME A APCH. ALL PHASES OF FLT WERE NORMAL UNTIL WE WERE CHANGED OVER TO TEB TWR. WHEN WE CALLED TEB TWR, WE WERE INSTRUCTED TO MAINTAIN 1500 FT UNTIL FURTHER ADVISED. UPON XING OVER THE TOP OF THE ARPT THE TWR INSTRUCTED US TO TURN R 20 DEGS. AFTER MAKING THE TURN, OUR TCAS SYS GAVE US A WARNING OF TFC AND I NOTED AN ACFT 100 FT BELOW US AND CLBING. THE TWR THEN INFORMED US OF THE TFC WHICH WAS A CITATION WHO WAS DEPARTING THE AREA ON A L DOWNWIND AND FOR US TO TURN DOWNWIND. AFTER WE WERE ESTABLISHED ON THE L DOWNWIND AND PASSING ABEAM THE NUMBERS, SOME ACFT HAD A STUCK MIKE ON THE FREQ. WE THEN LOOKED FOR TFC AND OBSERVED A CHALLENGER ON FINAL. WE THEN TURNED OUR BASE BEHIND THE CHALLENGER AND ABOUT THE TIME WE WERE GOING TO TURN FINAL THE FREQ BECAME CLR. THE TWR BEGAN TO SHOUT AT US AND INFORMED US THAT WE CUTOFF THE CHALLENGER AND FIRST TO MAKE A R 270 DEG TURN BUT THEN TO DSND TO 1000 FT AND THEN CIRCLE. I INFORMED THE TWR WE WERE UNABLE TO DSND TO 1000 FT, HE THEN STARTED TO ARGUE WITH US SO I THEN TOLD HIM THAT WE WERE EXECUTING THE PUBLISHED MISSED APCH PROC. WE THEN CONTACTED APCH CTL AND INFORMED HIM THAT WE WERE ON THE MISSED APCH. HE THEN ASKED WHAT WAS THE PROB. WE INFORMED HIM ABOUT THE PROB WITH TEB TWR. HE THEN TURNED US BACK ON THE APCH INSIDE OF JAYMO AND TO CALL THE TWR. WE THEN CALLED TEB TWR. TEB TWR THEN STARTED TO INFORM US TO MAINTAIN 1500 FT AND NOT TO TURN BASE UNTIL HE TOLD US LIKE THE LAST TIME. (NO SUCH CLRNC WAS EVER GIVEN ON THE PRIOR APCH.) AFTER TURNING DOWNWIND, I ASKED THE TWR FOR A SEQUENCE. THERE WAS NO RESPONSE. ABOUT 4 MI, THE TWR TOLD US TO TURN BASE. I THEN ASKED AGAIN FOR OUR SEQUENCE. THE TWR THEN INFORMED US THAT WE WERE #1 AND CLRED TO LAND. I RESPONDED TO THE CLRNC AND NOTED AN ACFT ON FINAL IN FRONT OF US. AFTER LNDG AND CLRING THE RWY, I THEN CALLED GND CTL AND WAS ISSUED A TAXI CLRNC TO TAXI VIA TXWY L TO TXWY C AND TO HOLD SHORT OF RWY 24. WE WERE THEN CLRED TO THE RAMP VIA TXWY C. UPON REACHING TXWY P, I NOTED A TWIN CESSNA APCHING FROM OUR L AT A FAST TAXI RATE. JUST AS WE STOPPED SHORT OF TXWY P, THE TWIN CESSNA PASSED OUR NOSE. I THEN CALLED GND CTL AND WAS TOLD TO STAND BY. AFTER WE WERE ON THE RAMP, GND CTL CALLED US BACK AND ASKED WHAT WE WANTED. I THEN ASKED GND CTL ABOUT THE TWIN CESSNA AND WHO WAS TO GIVE WAY. HIS REPLY WAS HE WAS SORRY.

Synopsis :

A FLT INSTRUCTOR IN A DA10 AT TEB EXPERIENCES CONFUSION WITH ATC INSTRUCTIONS.

ACN: 444880

Time

Date : 199907

Day : Fri

Local Time Of Day : 1201 To 1800

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : ZZZ.Airport

State Reference : US

Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 3900

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 25

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 450

ASRS Report : 444880

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Events

Anomaly.Non Adherence : FAR

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1

Resolatory Action.None Taken : Detected After The Fact

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

I THOUGHT MY CFI WAS TO EXPIRE JUL/XB/99. I WENT TO THE LCL FSDO TO REVALIDATE MY CFI AND DISCOVERED MY CFI HAD EXPIRED. IT WAS AT THIS TIME I REALIZED I HAD GIVEN A STUDENT A SIGNOFF ON JUL/XA/99 BY MISTAKE. TO PREVENT THIS FROM HAPPENING AGAIN, I WILL CHK MY EXPIRATION DATE ON MY CFI PRIOR TO ANY MORE SIGNOFFS. TO CORRECT THIS ERROR, I PLAN TO REVALIDATE MY CFI AND GIVE THE STUDENT FROM THE ERROR A NEW SIGNOFF FOR A NEW CHK RIDE.

Synopsis :

A CFI REALIZES HE SIGNED OFF AN OFFICIAL LOGBOOK RECORD FOR A STUDENT WHEN HIS CFI AUTH HAD EXPIRED.

Time

Date : 199907

Day : Wed

Local Time Of Day : 1801 To 2400

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : LGB.Airport

State Reference : CA

Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.Tower : LGB.Tower

Make Model : PA-28 Cherokee/Archer II/Dakota/Pillan/Warrior

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 240

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 31

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 30

ASRS Report : 445087

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Person / 3

Function.Controller : Local

Events

Anomaly.Non Adherence : FAR

Anomaly.Non Adherence : Published Procedure

Anomaly.Other Anomaly : Unstabilized Approach

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewB : 2

Resolatory Action.None Taken : Detected After The Fact

Resolatory Action.None Taken : Insufficient Time

Consequence.Other : Aircraft Damaged

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

I WAS FLYING UNDER INSTRUCTION FOR THE PREPARATION OF MY COMMERCIAL CHK RIDE, WHICH WAS PREVIOUSLY SCHEDULED FOR THE MORNING OF JUL/XB/99. THE EVENING OF JUL/XA/99, MY INSTRUCTOR HAD ME PRACTICING COMMERCIAL MANEUVERS FOR OVER 1 HR AND THEN HE REQUESTED THAT I FLY BACK TO OUR HOME AIRFIELD TO PRACTICE SHORT FIELD LNDGS AND TKOFS BEFORE WE CONCLUDED INSTRUCTION FOR THE DAY. WE ARRIVED INSIDE THE TFC PATTERN FOR RWY 25L AT LONG BEACH ARPT, I MADE A REQUEST TO THE TWR FOR 'L CLOSE TFC FOR RWY 25L.' THE TWR APPROVED OUR REQUEST AND CLRED US TO LAND ON THE SAME RWY. AFTER SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETING OUR FIRST ATTEMPT AT A SHORT FIELD LNDG, MY INSTRUCTOR HAD ME EXIT THE RWY TO SET UP FOR ANOTHER DEP FROM THAT SAME INTXN. AFTER CLRED TO TAXI ONTO THE SAME RWY FOR DEP, MY INSTRUCTOR TOOK CTL OF THE ACFT IN ORDER TO DEMONSTRATE A SHORT FIELD TKOF. DURING AND AFTER DEP, MY INSTRUCTOR HAD COMPLETE CTL OF THE ACFT UNTIL WE INITIATED OUR INITIAL L XWIND TURN, INSIDE THE TFC PATTERN FOR RWY 25L. AT THAT TIME, I REGAINED THE CTLS OF THE ACFT IN PREPARATION TO PERFORM A SECOND SHORT FIELD LNDG ON THE SAME RWY. AS WE WERE FLYING ALONG THE DOWNWIND LEG OF THE TFC PATTERN, MY INSTRUCTOR WAS EXPLAINING THE MOST DESIRABLE OR TARGET AIRSPDS, ALTS, AND VERT SPDS THAT HE WANTED ME TO TRY AND TARGET AT VARIOUS STAGES OF THIS MANEUVER IN ORDER TO ACCOMPLISH A SHORT FIELD LNDG TO PTS STANDARDS. TRYING TO ABSORB ALL OF THIS INFO IN SUCH A SHORT AMOUNT OF TIME, I BECAME DISTRACTED AND TOO FOCUSED ON WHAT WAS JUST EXPLAINED TO ME THAT I FORGOT TO PERFORM MY USUAL PRE-LNDG CHKLIST THOROUGHLY. I ONLY REMEMBERED TO ADD MY FLAPS, ENRICHED THE MIXTURE TO THE FULL POS, AND BROUGHT THE PROPS TO A FULL FORWARD POS ON SHORT FINAL. PAYING VERY CLOSE ATTN TO THE AIRSPD AND THE ALT WHILE I WAS ON GS (USING THE VASI), I THOUGHT THAT EVERYTHING WAS COMPLETED FOR A SUCCESSFUL LNDG. THIS OBVIOUSLY WAS NOT THE CASE ONCE WE TOUCHED DOWN ONLY TO REALIZE THAT THE BOTH OF US FORGOT TO ENGAGE THE LNDG GEAR SYS WHILE ON DOWNWIND. THE MAJOR LESSONS THAT I LEARNED THROUGH THIS EXPERIENCE ARE, WITHOUT ANY QUESTION, VALUABLE TOOLS THAT I WILL CARRY WITH MYSELF FOR A LIFETIME OF FLYING. IT MADE ME AWARE HOW EASY IT CAN BE TO BECOME SIDETRACKED OR DISTRACTED INSIDE A COCKPIT WHEN THERE IS SO MUCH GOING ON IN ADDITION TO JUST FLYING THE ACFT. I LEARNED THAT NO MATTER WHOM I FLY WITH, WHETHER IT IS MY FLT INSTRUCTOR OR MY BEST FRIEND, IT IS NECESSARY TO ALWAYS MAKE CHKLISTS A PRIORITY BEFORE ANYTHING ELSE IS DISCUSSED OR FOCUSED ON. IN ADDITION, IT IS NECESSARY TO FLY THE SAME CONSISTENT WAY WITH USING YOUR CHKLISTS REGARDLESS IF AN INSTRUCTOR IS ONBOARD. WHAT HAD HAPPENED TO US BOTH IS INEXCUSABLE AND SHOULD NEVER HAPPEN AGAIN. THERE IS NO ROOM IN A COCKPIT TO FEEL RELAXED AND COMFORTABLE WITHOUT WONDERING, 'WHAT MAY HAVE I FORGOTTEN?' THIS HAS BEEN A VALUABLE BUT VERY COSTLY LEARNING EXPERIENCE FOR THE BOTH OF US AND ONE WE HOPE TO NEVER ENCOUNTER AGAIN. AT LEAST, THROUGH IT ALL, IT WILL MAKE ME AWARE THAT WHEN I BECOME A FLT INSTRUCTOR IN THE FUTURE, I WILL ALWAYS MAKE SURE THAT SAFETY BECOMES A PRIORITY WITH MYSELF AND MY STUDENTS.

Synopsis :

A PVT PLT AND HIS INSTRUCTOR FLYING A PA28 IN PREPARATION FOR THE STUDENT'S COMMERCIAL CHK RIDE FAILED TO LOWER THE GEAR FOR LNDG RESULTING IN DAMAGE TO THE ACFT.

Time

Date : 199908

Day : Sun

Local Time Of Day : 0601 To 1200

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : SMX.Airport

State Reference : CA

Altitude.MSL.Bound Lower : 1700

Altitude.MSL.Bound Upper : 2400

Environment

Flight Conditions : IMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.ARTCC : ZLA.ARTCC

Controlling Facilities.Tower : SMX.Tower

Make Model : Skyhawk 172/Cutlass 172

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 11000

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 25

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 500

ASRS Report : 445205

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Person / 3

Function.Controller : Local

Person / 4

Function.Controller : Radar

Events

Anomaly.Altitude Deviation : Overshoot

Anomaly.Inflight Encounter : Weather

Anomaly.Non Adherence : Clearance

Anomaly.Non Adherence : Published Procedure

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1

Resolatory Action.Flight Crew : Returned To Original Clearance

Resolatory Action.Controller : Issued Advisory

Resolatory Action.Controller : Issued New Clearance

Supplementary

Problem Areas : ATC Human Performance

Problem Areas : Chart Or Publication

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Problem Areas : Weather

Narrative :

I WAS CONDUCTING IFR TRAINING ON AN INST XCOUNTRY FLT FROM SJC TO SMX. WE (ACFT X) WERE INBOUND ON SMX VOR RWY 12 APCH AND OPERATING IN IMC. WE HAD REQUESTED AND HAD BEEN APPROVED TO EXECUTE THE PUBLISHED MISSED APCH PROC. OUTSIDE OF NINOO INTXN (IAF) ZLA INSTRUCTED US TO CONTACT SMX ATCT AND WE COMPLIED. SMX REQUESTED WE RPT THE VOR, WE STATED WE WOULD AND WERE XING NINOO. THEY THEN REQUESTED WE CANCEL IFR. I INFORMED THEM WE WERE STILL IMC, BUT WOULD RPT THE VOR (FAF). THE TWR THEN TOLD US TO ENTER A R DOWNWIND FOR RWY 30 AND RPT CANCELING IFR. AGAIN WE INFORMED THE TWR WE WERE STILL IMC, OUTSIDE THE VOR, AND PLANNING A MISSED APCH. ON THE FREQ WE HEARD THE TWR TELL A NUMBER OF ACFT THEY WERE WAITING FOR A CESSNA (US) INBOUND ON THE VOR APCH. THEN WE WERE TOLD TO EXECUTE THE MISSED APCH AT 2 MI W OF THE ARPT, RPT CANCELING IFR AND ENTERING R DOWNWIND. AGAIN, I STATED WE WERE STILL OUTSIDE THE VOR AND IMC. AT THIS TIME WE WERE LEVEL AT 1700 FT MSL. JUST XING THE VOR, WERE TOLD TO GO MISSED AND CONTACT CTR. INSTEAD OF CONTINUING TO THE MISSED APCH POINT, MY STUDENT STARTED A L CLBING TURN AND RADIOED WE WERE CLBING TO 3000 FT. I RECHKED THE MISSED APCH ALT, DISCOVERED IT WAS 2000 FT AND STARTED A DSCNT BACK TO 2000 FT FROM 2400 FT. I HAD ALLOWED THE TWR TO DISTRACT ME FROM MY PRIMARY DUTIES OF MONITORING MY STUDENT ACTIONS. I WOULD LIKE TO REMIND ALL INSTRUCTORS TO REVIEW THE BASIC RULE -- AVIATE, NAV, COMMUNICATE.

Synopsis :

INSTRUCTIONAL C172 IS DIRECTED TO EXECUTE MISSED APCH BY SMX AND CLBS ABOVE PUBLISHED MISSED APCH ALT.

Time

Date : 199908

Day : Tue

Local Time Of Day : 0601 To 1200

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : RAL.Airport

State Reference : CA

Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.Tower : RAL.Tower

Make Model : Cessna 150

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 1400

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 300

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 100

ASRS Report : 445230

Person / 2

Function.Controller : Local

Person / 3

Function.Controller : Ground

Events

Anomaly.Incursion : Landing Without Clearance

Anomaly.Non Adherence : FAR

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1

Resolatory Action.None Taken : Detected After The Fact

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

WHILE PRACTICING MULTIPLE TOUCH AND GOES, A FULL-STOP LNDG WAS MADE WITHOUT PERMISSION TO LAND OR FOR A TOUCH AND GO. AFTER MAKING A TOUCH AND GO, TWR MADE NO ATTEMPT TO GIVE US PERMISSION TO LAND. THE USUAL PROC IS FOR ACFT TO RPT DOWNWIND ABEAM THE TWR, AND THEN RECEIVE PERMISSION TO LAND. I WAS DISTRACTED WHILE GIVING INSTRUCTION AND FORGOT TO ASK FOR PERMISSION TO LAND. AFTER CLRING THE RWY, GND WAS CONTACTED AND NO DISCUSSION WAS MADE ABOUT THE INCIDENT. IN THE FUTURE I CAN BE MORE DILIGENT WHEN GIVING INSTRUCTION.

Synopsis :

A CFI TEACHING A STUDENT IN A C150 WAS IN THE PATTERN AT RAL, SHOOTING MULTIPLE TOUCH AND GOES. DISTRACTED WHILE TEACHING, THE CFI MADE A FULL-STOP LNDG WITHOUT CLRNC.

Time

Date : 199908

Day : Mon

Local Time Of Day : 0601 To 1200

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : OLV.Airport

State Reference : MS

Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Make Model : PA-34-200 Seneca I

Component / 1

Aircraft Component : Propeller Blade

Aircraft Reference : X

Problem : Improperly Operated

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 1300

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 30

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 175

ASRS Report : 445672

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 501

Events

Anomaly.Aircraft Equipment Problem : Critical

Anomaly.Conflict : Ground Critical

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewB : 2

Resolatory Action.None Taken : Detected After The Fact

Consequence.Other : Aircraft Damaged

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Aircraft

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

DURING A MULTI-ENG INSTRUCTIONAL PERIOD, MY STUDENT, A PVT PLT WITH MORE THAN 500 HRS TOTAL TIME, LANDED A LITTLE HARD AFTER A FAIRLY NORMAL APCH. IN FACT, THERE WAS NOTHING THAT OCCURRED DURING THE APCH TO INDICATE THAT THE SUBSEQUENT LNDG WOULD BE SO PROBLEMATIC. AT THE POINT OF TOUCHDOWN, THE PLANE BOUNCED UP AND PORPOISED AT WHICH TIME I TOOK OVER THE CTLS AND ACCOMPLISHED A GAR. AFTER THE GAR, WE ACCOMPLISHED 3 ADDITIONAL TKOFS AND LNDGS, AS THERE WAS NO INDICATION, WHATSOEVER, THAT THE AIRPLANE HAD SUSTAINED A PROP STRIKE ON THE R PROP. IN FACT, THE AIRPLANE PERFORMED EQUALLY WELL AFTER THIS LNDG AS IT HAD PREVIOUSLY. THERE WAS NO VIBRATION AND ALL ENG GAUGES INDICATED NORMALLY. WE TAXIED TO THE RAMP AND ACCOMPLISHED THE SHUTDOWN CHKLST. UPON DISEMBARKING THE AIRPLANE, WE WERE SHOCKED TO DISCOVER THAT THE TIPS OF THE R PROP HAD SUSTAINED DAMAGE. IN FOLLOW-UP DISCUSSION WITH THE MECH, HE INDICATED THAT THE PROP WAS DAMAGED BEYOND REPAIR. THE ENG WAS THOROUGHLY CHKED AND FOUND TO BE IN PERFECT CONDITION, IE, NO DAMAGE. SOME SCUFFING WAS NOTED ON BOTH SIDES OF THE NOSE GEAR TIRE.

Synopsis :

A CFI, INSTRUCTING IN A SENECA I, EXECUTED A GAR AFTER THE STUDENT TOUCHED DOWN HARD, CAUSING THE ACFT TO PORPOISE. THEY NOTICED NOTHING AND CONTINUED THE TRAINING SESSION. THEY DISCOVERED THE PROP STRIKE ON THE R PROP AFTER SHUTTING DOWN.

Time

Date : 199908
Day : Mon
Local Time Of Day : 1201 To 1800

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : HPN.Airport
State Reference : NY
Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 1500

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.Tower : HPN.Tower
Make Model : Small Aircraft, Low Wing, 1 Eng, Fixed Gear

Aircraft / 2

Controlling Facilities.Tower : HPN.Tower
Make Model : Skyhawk 172/Cutlass 172

Person / 1

Function.Oversight : PIC
Function.Instruction : Instructor
Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot
Experience.Flight Time.Total : 850
Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 300
Experience.Flight Time.Type : 800
ASRS Report : 445679

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee
Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot

Person / 3

Function.Oversight : PIC
Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot

Person / 4

Function.Controller : Local

Events

Anomaly.Conflict : Airborne Critical
Anomaly.Non Adherence : Published Procedure
Anomaly.Non Adherence : Required Legal Separation
Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1
Resolatory Action.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Airport
Problem Areas : ATC Human Performance
Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

I WAS WITH A STUDENT DOING TOUCH AND GOES IN CLOSED TFC. ON THE DOWNWIND FOR OUR THIRD TOUCH AND GO, TWR ASKED US TO FALL IN BEHIND THE CESSNA OFF OUR R FRONT. I LOOKED FOR TFC BUT HE WAS INITIALLY BLOCKED BY THE R WINDSHIELD PILLAR OF OUR ACFT. I MOVED MY HEAD TO LOOK AROUND THE PILLAR AND SAW AN ACFT (CESSNA 172) ENTERING THE 45 DEG MID-FIELD L DOWNWIND ON A COLLISION COURSE WITH US. I ROLLED SHARPLY TO THE R AND DSNDED TO AVOID HIM AND THEN I TURNED BACK TO THE L TO FOLLOW HIM. ALL OF THIS TOOK ROUGHLY 10 SECONDS. CONTRIBUTING FACTORS WERE: MY CONCENTRATION ON MY STUDENT'S PROCS AND THE LNDG CHKLST IN ADDITION TO SCANNING THE BASE AND FINAL FOR TFC POINTED OUT BY THE TWR DISTRACTED ME FROM SCANNING FOR TFC ENTERING THE DOWNWIND. THE OTHER ACFT PLT MAY HAVE BEEN SIMILARLY DISTRACTED. THE TWR WAS VERY BUSY AND MIGHT HAVE BEEN DISTRACTED ALSO, HOWEVER, WHEN HE DID POINT OUT THE TFC HE SAID NOTHING OF THE UNUSUALLY CLOSE PROX. IN MY OPINION, THE TWR ALLOWED HIMSELF TO BECOME OVERWHELMED. MAYBE THERE WERE TOO MANY ACFT IN CLOSED TFC, OR MAYBE HE JUST SQUEEZED EVERYONE IN TOO CLOSE. EITHER WAY BOTH ACFT FAILED TO SEE AND AVOID AND THE TWR FAILED TO SAFELY SPACE TFC IN THE PATTERN. IN HIGH TFC AREAS DURING TIMES OF INCREASED WORKLOAD IN THE COCKPIT, IT IS EASY TO BECOME DISTRACTED AND GET BEHIND. THIS GOES EQUALLY FOR TWR CTRLRS WHO SOMETIMES BITE OFF MORE THAN THEY CAN CHEW. PLTS MUST MAINTAIN THEIR SCAN FOR TFC AND NOT GET LOST INSIDE THE COCKPIT. TWR CTRLRS MUST DO THEIR BEST TO KEEP TFC SEPARATED IN THE TFC PATTERN.

Synopsis :

SMA INSTRUCTOR AND TRAINEE HAD NMAC IN THE PATTERN AT HPN.

Time

Date : 199908

Day : Fri

Local Time Of Day : 1801 To 2400

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : FUL.Airport

State Reference : CA

Altitude.MSL.Bound Lower : 0

Altitude.MSL.Bound Upper : 1100

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.Tower : FUL.Tower

Make Model : Skyhawk 172/Cutlass 172

Aircraft / 2

Controlling Facilities.Tower : FUL.Tower

Make Model : Skylane 182/Rg Turbo Skylane/Rg

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 350

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 60

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 280

ASRS Report : 445811

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Person / 3

Function.Controller : Local

Person / 4

Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot

Events

Anomaly.Conflict : NMAC

Anomaly.Non Adherence : Required Legal Separation

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1

Resolatory Action.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action

Resolatory Action.Controller : Issued Alert

Supplementary

Problem Areas : ATC Human Performance

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

I WAS HELPING A STUDENT WITH LNDGS, DOING TOUCH AND GOES AT FULLERTON MUNICIPAL. WE WERE IN R CLOSED TFC. ON OUR SECOND TOUCH AND GO, THE TWR SAID (AS WE UNDERSTOOD IT), 'CESSNA 123, L TFC, RWY 24.' WE READ BACK THE INSTRUCTION AND, AS WE WERE ROLLING OUT ON, L XWIND, TWR ASKED US IF WE WERE DEPARTING. WE TOLD THEM NO. HE TOLD US THEN TO CONTINUE L DOWNWIND AT 1100 FT. SO, WE SAID 'ROGER.' AS WE TURNED TO BASE LEG, TWR SAID 'CESSNA 123, WHY ARE YOU ON BASE? MAKE IMMEDIATE R TURN. TFC 12 O'CLOCK POS, CESSNA 182 ON FINAL.' WE THEN SAW TFC COMING FROM OUR R TO L IN FRONT OF US. WE TURNED A STEEP R TURN TO AVOID THE TFC. TWR THEN ASKED WHY WE WERE ON BASE. HE TOLD US TO EXTEND OUR DOWNWIND. WE THEN TOLD HIM WE UNDERSTOOD THAT HE WANTED US TO FLY THE DOWNWIND AT 1100 FT, IN WHICH WE COMPLIED. WE CONTINUED TO FLY DOWNWIND UNTIL THE TWR CALLED OUR BASE. THE FACTOR THAT LEAD TO THE NEAR-MISS IS THE MISCOM BTWN THE CTL TWR AND US. ALSO, WE DID NOT SEE THE ACFT ON FINAL UNTIL THE CTL TWR TOLD US. PROPER CORRECTIVE ACTIONS WERE TAKEN. IT IS POSSIBLE THAT THERE WAS A BLOCK (DUAL XMISSION) ON THE RADIO. WHEN THE TWR GAVE OUR INSTRUCTIONS, BUT BOTH MY STUDENT AND I HEARD THE TWR SAY, 'FLY THE DOWNWIND AT 1100 FT,' BUT DID NOT HEAR, 'EXTEND DOWNWIND'.

Synopsis :

AN APPARENTLY CONFUSED CONTRACT TWR CTLR ASKED MORE SARCASTIC QUESTIONS OF THE RPTR THAN DISSEMINATING URGENTLY NEEDED INFO. AN NMAC OCCURRED AS A RESULT OF THE CTLR'S OVERUSE OF THE FREQ.

Time

Date : 199908

Day : Tue

Local Time Of Day : 1201 To 1800

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : BFL.Airport

State Reference : CA

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 1100

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.Tower : BFL.Tower

Make Model : Baron 58/58tc

Aircraft / 2

Controlling Facilities.Tower : BFL.Tower

Make Model : Gulfstream IV

Person / 1

Function.Oversight : PIC

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 700

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 100

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 70

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Person / 3

Function.Oversight : PIC

Function.Flight Crew : Captain

Person / 4

Function.Controller : Local

Events

Anomaly.Conflict : NMAC

Anomaly.Non Adherence : FAR

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewB : 2

Resolatory Action.None Taken : Detected After The Fact

Supplementary

Problem Areas : ATC Human Performance

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

WHILE CONDUCTING TOUCH AND GOES IN ESTABLISHED R CLOSED TFC FOR RWY 30R AT XYZ, A GULFSTREAM 4 WAS FLYING THE VOR-A APCH INTO XYZ. AFTER MAKING A TOUCH AND GO, WE WERE FLYING ON THE UPWIND LEG OF THE PATTERN WHEN THE GULFSTREAM PASSED US AT OUR 9:30 O'CLOCK POS. WE WERE COMPLETELY UNAWARE OF HIS POS UNTIL HE PASSED DANGEROUSLY CLOSE. THERE WAS NO TIME FOR US TO TAKE EVASIVE ACTION. I BELIEVE THAT THE CARELESS OP OF THE GULFSTREAM PLT WAS A MAJOR FACTOR IN THIS NMAC.

Synopsis :

BE58 INSTRUCTOR AND STUDENT HAVE NMAC WITH GLF4 IN TFC PATTERN AT BFL.

Time

Date : 199909

Day : Fri

Local Time Of Day : 1201 To 1800

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : PRC.Airport

State Reference : AZ

Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 400

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.Tower : PRC.Tower

Make Model : Duchess 76

Aircraft / 2

Controlling Facilities.Tower : PRC.Tower

Make Model : Any Unknown or Unlisted Aircraft Manufacturer

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 1050

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 200

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 100

ASRS Report : 449911

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Person / 3

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Person / 4

Function.Controller : Local

Events

Anomaly.Conflict : NMAC

Anomaly.Non Adherence : Clearance

Anomaly.Non Adherence : FAR

Anomaly.Non Adherence : Required Legal Separation

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 3

Resolatory Action.None Taken : Insufficient Time

Supplementary

Problem Areas : ATC Human Performance

Problem Areas : Environmental Factor

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

TOUCH-AND-GOES AT PRC. WAS CONDUCTING A SIMULATED SINGLE PATTERN. ADVISED TWR THAT WE WERE SIMULATED SINGLE. TWR ACKNOWLEDGED WHILE WE WERE R DOWNWIND FOR RWY 21R AND SAID 'ROGER, TFC TO FOLLOW R BASE TO FINAL.' I ACKNOWLEDGED TFC INSIGHT. CTLR SAID 'CLR TOUCH-AND-GO RWY 21L.' I ACKNOWLEDGED 'CLR TOUCH-AND-GO RWY 21L.' AT THIS TIME, I BELIEVED THE TWR CTLR WAS TRYING TO HELP US OUT SINCE WE WERE SIMULATED SINGLE WITH THE LONGER RWY. THIS PRACTICE OF HAVING STUDENTS LAND ON THE RWY 21L WHILE BEING ON TWR 128.75 (NORMALLY 125.3) HAS HAPPENED NUMEROUS TIMES BEFORE. WE NEVER THOUGHT TWICE ABOUT BEING CLRED TOUCH-AND-GO OR RWY 21L FROM RWY 21R PATTERN. OTHER PLT OF OTHER ACFT SAID THAT WE CAME WITHIN 100-200 FT OF THEM. WE NEVER SAW THEM ONCE.

Synopsis :

A BE76 INSTRUCTOR PLT AND STUDENT ALMOST COLLIDE WITH ANOTHER ACFT IN TRAINING DURING VISUAL APCHS TO RWYS 21L&R AT PRC, AZ.

Time

Date : 199909

Day : Mon

Local Time Of Day : 1201 To 1800

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : NZC.Airport

State Reference : FL

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 2700

Environment

Flight Conditions : Marginal

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.Tower : NZC.Tower

Make Model : Skyhawk 172/Cutlass 172

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 2200

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 100

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 900

ASRS Report : 449936

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Person / 3

Function.Controller : Local

Events

Anomaly.Airspace Violation : Entry

Anomaly.Inflight Encounter : Weather

Anomaly.Non Adherence : FAR

Independent Detector.Other.ControllerA : 3

Resolatory Action.None Taken : Detected After The Fact

Consequence.FAA : Reviewed Incident With Flight Crew

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Airport

Problem Areas : ATC Human Performance

Problem Areas : Chart Or Publication

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Problem Areas : Weather

Narrative :

ON SEP/XA/99, WHILE RETURNING FROM A XCOUNTRY TRIP WITH A STUDENT, I EXPERIENCED WHAT I BELIEVE MAY BE A SIT THAT COULD LEAD TO A COMPROMISE IN SAFETY IN THE JACKSONVILLE AREA. FOR THE LAST SEVERAL MONTHS, THE NEWS MEDIA HAS CARRIED STORIES CONCERNING THE SHUTDOWN OF CECIL FIELD (NZC). IN FACT, THEY ACTUALLY FILMED THE LAST OF THE AIRPLANES DEPARTING CECIL FOR THEIR NEW HOME BASE. IT IS OUR UNDERSTANDING ALL AVIATION ACTIVITY HAS BEEN SUSPENDED AND THE FACILITY IS UNDER CONSIDERATION BY VARIOUS NON AVIATION RELATED ENTITIES. ON THE RETURN LEG OF OUR XCOUNTRY, WE ENCOUNTERED CLOUD COVERAGE. WE ATTEMPTED TO CONTACT NZC ON SEVERAL OCCASIONS TO REQUEST A CLRNC TO FLY THROUGH THEIR AIRSPACE AT 2500 FT, BUT RECEIVED NO RESPONSE. CLOUDS TO THE N AND S PREVENTED US FROM DIVERTING, SO WE AGAIN ATTEMPTED THE RADIO CONTACT AND AGAIN RECEIVED NO RESPONSE. WITH THE AID OF A GPS, WE ATTEMPTED TO CIRCUMVENT THE AIRSPACE. WHILE I FELT WE HAD SUCCESSFULLY AVOIDED A VIOLATION OF THE CLASS D AIRSPACE, WHEN WE ARRIVED AT CRAIG FIELD, WE WERE ADVISED TO CONTACT THE CECIL FIELD TWR. MY PRIMARY CONCERN IS THAT MOST JACKSONVILLE PLTS ARE UNDER THE IMPRESSION THAT ALL OPS AT CECIL FIELD HAVE BEEN SUSPENDED. SO, IF WE DON'T GET A RESPONSE ON THE RADIO (AND WE CONFIRM OUR RADIO IS WORKING) WE ASSUME THEY HAVE. NOW, I KNOW THAT THIS BELIEF IS NOT JUSTIFIED AS LONG AS THE SECTIONAL CHARTS SHOW THE CLASS D AIRSPACE. HOWEVER, FOR THE SAFETY OF ALL PLTS, THE TWR PERSONNEL AT CECIL FIELD NEED TO DILIGENTLY MONITOR THEIR FREQS AND IF THEY ARE NOT GOING TO DO THAT, NOTAMS SHOULD BE ISSUED TO THOSE FLYING IN THEIR IMMEDIATE VICINITY.

Synopsis :

A C172 INSTRUCTOR PLT AND STUDENT FLY TOO CLOSE TO THE CLASS D AIRSPACE OF NZC, FL.

Time

Date : 199909

Day : Thu

Local Time Of Day : 0601 To 1200

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : FTY.Airport

State Reference : CA

Altitude.AGL.Bound Lower : 0

Altitude.AGL.Bound Upper : 300

Environment

Flight Conditions : Mixed

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.Tower : FTY.Tower

Make Model : Skyhawk 172/Cutlass 172

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 330

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 40

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 256

ASRS Report : 449940

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Person / 3

Function.Controller : Local

Events

Anomaly.Conflict : Ground Less Severe

Anomaly.Inflight Encounter : Weather

Anomaly.Non Adherence : Clearance

Anomaly.Non Adherence : FAR

Anomaly.Non Adherence : Required Legal Separation

Independent Detector.Other.ControllerA : 3

Resolatory Action.Controller : Issued New Clearance

Consequence.FAA : Investigated

Consequence.FAA : Reviewed Incident With Flight Crew

Consequence.Other : Emotional Trauma

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Aircraft

Problem Areas : ATC Human Performance

Problem Areas : Environmental Factor

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Problem Areas : Weather

Narrative :

I DEPARTED ON A LCL VFR TRAINING FLT FROM FTY ON SEP/XA/99 AT ABOUT AB00. WE HAD SOME RADIO PROBS ON THE GND ONE TIME, BUT THEY WERE FINE. THE WX WAS 5500 FT BROKEN WITH 7 MI VISIBILITY. WE TOOK OFF ON RWY 8 AND HEADED NW. THE TWR TOLD ME THAT A FREQ CHANGE WAS APPROVED WHILE TURNING XWIND TO DEPART TO THE NW. THE WX STARTED TO DIMINISH, SO MY STUDENT AND I HEADED BACK TO THE ARPT. THERE ARE SOME TOWER TANKS LOCATED 8 MI NW OF FTY. AT THE TOWER TANKS, I CALLED THE TWR TO TELL THEM THAT WE WERE ON OUR WAY IN. THE VISIBILITY IS NOW MARGINAL AND THE RAIN IS COMING DOWN VERY HEAVILY. THE TWR THEN TOLD ME TO IDENT, I DID. AFTER A WHILE HE SAID I WAS 1 1/2 MI FROM THE ARPT, TURN TO ENTER A R BASE RWY 26. I CONTINUED THE APCH. WHEN I GOT ON THE GND, I WAS INSTRUCTED TO CALL THE TWR. THE TWR SAID THEY INSTRUCTED ME TO GO AROUND DUE TO ANOTHER AIRPLANE. I HEARD NOTHING. THEY CALLED A FEW TIMES THEY SAID, BUT I DIDN'T HEAR THEM. THEY SAID I DID NOT COMPLY WITH ATC. THEY SAID THAT THE OTHER AIRPLANE WAS NOT COMPLETELY OFF THE RWY WHEN I CROSSED THE THRESHOLD. I SAW NO ONE ON THE RWY. I DID SEE A BARON OFF OF THE RWY ON A TXWY. THE WX WAS VERY BAD AND RAINY. I HAVE DONE MOST OF MY TRAINING AT THE NASHVILLE ARPT. I HAVE ALWAYS COMPLIED WITH ATC INSTRUCTIONS. THE TWR SAYS A PERSON WILL CONTACT ME FROM THE LCL FSDO TO TALK. A LETTER OF DEV MAY BE WRITTEN. I DISAGREE WITH WHAT THE MAN IN THE TWR SAYS HE SAW WITH THE OTHER ACFT AND WITH WHAT I SAW.

Synopsis :

A C172 INSTRUCTOR PLT LANDS HER ACFT ON RWY 26 WHILE ANOTHER ACFT WAS ABOUT TO CLR THE RWY AT FTY, GA.

Time

Date : 199909

Day : Sat

Local Time Of Day : 1201 To 1800

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : CXO.Airport

State Reference : TX

Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Make Model : Sierra 24

Component / 1

Aircraft Component : Gear Extend/Retract Mechanism

Aircraft Reference : X

Problem : Malfunctioning

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 1995

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 150

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 3

ASRS Report : 449954

Person / 2

Function.Observation : Passenger

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Person / 3

Function.Controller : Local

Events

Anomaly.Aircraft Equipment Problem : Critical

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1

Resolatory Action.Flight Crew : Landed In Emergency Condition

Consequence.Other : Aircraft Damaged

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Aircraft

Narrative :

I WAS REQUESTED BY ONE OF MY STUDENTS TO FLY WITH HIM IN THE PLANE HE WAS INTERESTED IN BUYING. EVEN THOUGH I HAD A BUSY SCHEDULE, I SOMEHOW MADE TIME FOR AN HR IN THE AFTERNOON TO FLY. AFTER A THOROUGH PREFLT INSPECTION BY MY STUDENT AND MYSELF, I SAT DOWN IN THE ACFT AND DID A THOROUGH FAMILIARIZATION OF THE ACFT BY GOING THROUGH THE ACFT MANUAL, ESPECIALLY THE EMER PROCS. WE DEPARTED DAVID WAYNE HOOKS ARPT TOWARDS THE N, AND I DEMONSTRATED SLOW FLT, STALLS AND STEEP TURNS, AFTER WHICH HE DID THE SAME. WE DECIDED TO TAKE THE ACFT TO CONROE TO MAKE SURE THE HSI IS WORKING PROPERLY AND TO SEE HOW THE ACFT BEHAVES ON LNDGS. DURING THE ILS APCH UPON PERFORMING GUMPS CHK, WE REALIZED THAT WE HAD ONLY 2 GREEN LIGHTS. AFTER PERFORMING ALL THE REQUIRED CHKS, WE DECIDED TO ASK THE OTHER TFC ON THE GND IF THEY COULD SEE OUR L MAIN GEAR. THE REPLY WAS A NEGATIVE, UPON WHICH I DECIDED TO CLB BACK UP TO SAFER ALT TO PERFORM THE PROC FOR MANUAL LNDG GEAR EXTENSION. AFTER PERFORMING THE REQUIRED EMER PROCS AS PER THE ACFT OPERATING HANDBOOK WE DECIDED TO PROCEED TOWARDS HOOKS ARPT AND REQUESTED A LOW APCH AND ASKED THE TWR TO SEE IF OUR L MAIN GEAR WAS DOWN. AS SUSPECTED, THE REPLY WAS A NEGATIVE. TWR ASKED US OF OUR INTENTIONS AND I ADVISED THEM THAT I WAS GOING TO CLB BACK UP AND REPEAT ALL THE REQUIRED PROCS FOR EMER LNDG GEAR EXTENSION. WE HAD NO LUCK. AGAIN, WE WERE ASKED BY THE TWR OF OUR INTENTIONS AND I DECIDED TO DO A TOUCH-AND-GO ON THE R MAIN, HOPING THE L MAIN WOULD DROP OUT AS WE TOUCHED DOWN, I HAD NO LUCK. BY THIS TIME I HAD DECIDED THAT I WAS GOING TO LAND WITH THE GEAR IN UP POS AFTER BURNING AS MUCH FUEL AS POSSIBLE. WE ADVISED THEM THAT WE WERE GOING TO TAKE A TRIP IN THE VICINITY OF THE ARPT TO BURN THE FUEL AND PRACTICE THE PROCS AND PREPARE FOR OUR LNDG. THE TWR ADVISED US TO STAY WITHIN 15 NM OF THE ARPT, AND WE DID. WE WERE ASKED TO ADVISE THE TWR 5 MINS BEFORE THE ARR. I REQUESTED FOR A PRACTICE LOW APCH SO THAT WE COULD PRACTICE THE EMER PROCS FOR A GEAR UP LNDG. MY STUDENT WAS ASSIGNED TO SHUT OFF FUEL VALVE, TURN OFF THE IGNITION AND THE MASTER WHILE I CONCENTRATED ON THE LNDG, AND OF COURSE I TOOK CARE OF THE MIXTURES. I SLOWED THE ACFT TO THE SPD WHICH I KNEW THIS ACFT COULD HANDLE SMOOTHLY WITH FULL FLAPS, AND FLARED OVER THE RWY TO ALLOW THE ACFT TO TOUCH DOWN AS SMOOTHLY AS POSSIBLE WITH THE LEAST AMOUNT OF DAMAGE TO THE ACFT. THE CONCLUSION IS THAT WE MADE IT SAFELY AND THERE WAS ONLY MINOR DAMAGE TO THE ACFT. THE OWNER OF THE ACFT WAS VERY HAPPY. THE FAA INSPECTOR CALLED IT A SYS FAILURE AND COMMENDED ME FOR HANDLING THE EMER IN A PROFESSIONAL AND SAFE MANNER.

Synopsis :

A BE24 IS LANDED GEAR UP WHEN THE L MAIN GEAR FAILS TO EXTEND UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES AT CXO, TX.

Time

Date : 199909

Day : Sun

Local Time Of Day : 1201 To 1800

Place

State Reference : OR

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 4000

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.TRACON : EUG.TRACON

Make Model : PA-28 Cherokee Arrow Iv

Aircraft / 2

Controlling Facilities.TRACON : EUG.TRACON

Make Model : Cessna Aircraft Undifferentiated or Other Model

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 365

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 32

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 250

ASRS Report : 449960

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 3920

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 60

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 80

ASRS Report : 450062

Person / 3

Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot

Events

Anomaly.Other Spatial Deviation : Track Or Heading Deviation

Anomaly.Conflict : Airborne Less Severe

Anomaly.Non Adherence : Clearance

Independent Detector.Other.ControllerA : 4

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewB : 2

Resolatory Action.Flight Crew : Took Precautionary Avoidance Action

Resolatory Action.Controller : Issued Advisory

Resolatory Action.Controller : Issued New Clearance

Consequence.FAA : Reviewed Incident With Flight Crew

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Airspace Structure

Problem Areas : ATC Human Performance

Problem Areas : Environmental Factor

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

THE LCL TRAINING FLT ORIGINATED FOR EUG. THE PLAN WAS TO DO MULTIPLE PRACTICE APCHS AT CVO WITH A HOLDING PRACTICE. THE FIRST APCH INTO CVO WENT WELL, AND WAS FOLLOWED BY THE PUBLISHED MISSED WITH A HOLD AT SHEDD INTXN. AFTER HOLDING FOR A WHILE, WE REQUESTED A SECOND APCH TO CVO. OUR REQUEST WAS GRANTED. I FLEW ANOTHER APCH AND ONCE AGAIN WE DECIDED TO DO THE PUBLISHED MISS. ON THE MISSED APCH, WE ADVISED ATC THAT WE WANTED TO HOLD AT SHEDD AGAIN. HE GAVE US CLRNC TO HOLD AT SHEDD. I TOLD THE CTLR THAT I WAS ESTABLISHED IN THE HOLD. I THEN DEMONSTRATED HOW TO CORRECT FOR THE XWIND, AND ADJUST MY OUTBOUND TIME IN ORDER TO MAKE OUR INBOUND LEG 1 MIN IN LENGTH. SOME TIME LATER, WHILE MAKING ANOTHER TURN FOR THE INBOUND LEG, WE HEARD ATC ADVISING ANOTHER PLT OF AN ACFT AT 4000 FT. AS WE ROUNDED THE CORNER TURNING INBOUND, THE CTLR CALLED THE TFC OUT TO US AS 12-1 O'CLOCK POS, LESS THAN 1/2 MI AT 4000 FT. I IMMEDIATELY REMOVED MY HOOD (VIEW LIMITING DEVICE) IN ORDER TO HELP SPOT THE TFC. WHEN WE SAW THE TFC, IT WAS ON A CONVERGING COURSE COMING FROM OUR 1 O'CLOCK POS. I WOULD ESTIMATE ITS PROX AS 1500 FT HORIZ AND 0 FT VERT SEPARATION. I SAW HIM MAKE A STEEP TURN TO THE L. HE WAS ON THE PROTECTED SIDE OF THE HOLD, MANEUVERING INSIDE OF OUR HOLDING PATTERN. NOW WE WERE WINGS LEVEL ON THE INBOUND LEG OF THE HOLDING PATTERN AND WE IMMEDIATELY REQUESTED AN ALTERNATE CLRNC, WHICH WAS A REQUEST FOR THE GPS APCH TO RWY 3 AT EUG. THE CTLR RESPONDED WITH A QUESTION, 'HOW WOULD YOU LIKE TO DO THAT?' I REPLIED, 'WE'LL GET BACK TO YOU ON THAT.' WE LOOKED AT THE APCH PLATE AND SAW THAT FRITT WAS THE IAF AND WE DECIDED TO REQUEST THE APCH VIA DIRECT TO FRITT. UNFORTUNATELY, THE CTLR GOT EXTREMELY BUSY ON THE RADIO. ABOUT THIS TIME WE REACHED SHEDD AND HAD NO CHOICE BUT TO CONTINUE STRAIGHT OUT. THE HOLD CALLED FOR ANOTHER R TURN WHICH WOULD HAVE PLACED US IN CLOSER TO THE MANEUVERING ACFT AND CREATE A COLLISION HAZARD. DUE TO THE UNFORESEEN COMBINATION OF CIRCUMSTANCES AND THE RESULTING SIT THAT CALLED FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION, WE NEEDED TO DEVIATE FROM OUR CLRNC LIMIT AND DEPART THE HOLD. DUE TO THE EMER NATURE OF THE SIT I WAS TOLD THAT WE COULD NOT SAFELY TURN R, WHICH WOULD PLACE US CLOSER TO THE MANEUVERING ACFT AND JEOPARDIZE THE SAFETY OF THE FLT. WHEN THE CTLR GOT A BREAK IN COM, HE STATED, 'I SEE YOU HAVE DEPARTED THE HOLD, WHAT ARE YOUR INTENTIONS?' I CAME BACK, 'PROCEEDING DIRECT TO FRITT.' THIS FLT PATH KEPT US AWAY FROM THE MANEUVERING ACFT AND RESOLVED THE NATURE OF THE EMER. THE CTLR GAVE US OUR NEW CLRNC TO EUG VIA FRITT AND GPS RWY 3 APCH. THE APCH WENT WELL AND THE FLT CONCLUDED WITH A SAFE LNDG AT EUG. IN RETROSPECT THE DEP FROM THE HOLD SHOULD HAVE BEEN PRECEDED BY ADDITIONAL RADIO COMS TO ALLOW THE CTLR TO BE MORE AWARE OF OUR NEED FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION REGARDING OUR FLT SAFETY. PREVENTIVE ACTIONS: 1) MORE DETAILED RADIO COMS. 2) MORE FORCEFUL RADIO COMS. 3) RPT TO ATC OF VFR CONDITIONS. 4) TRAINING IN LESS CONGESTED TIMES. SUPPLEMENTAL INFO FROM ACN 450062: FACTORS AFFECTING THE EVENTS: IF ATC HAD ADVISED OF THE TFC EARLIER, BETTER SEPARATION WOULD HAVE BEEN POSSIBLE WHICH WOULD HAVE POTENTIALLY ALLOWED US TO REMAIN IN THE HOLD SAFELY. WHILE WE WANTED TO REQUEST AN IMMEDIATE DEP FROM THE HOLD DUE TO THE CONFLICTING POS OF THE VFR TFC, BUSY RADIO XMISSIONS, PROVIDED LITTLE OPENING FOR OUR COM. IN CONCLUSION, I THINK THAT MY ACTIONS DESCRIBED ABOVE ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE SPIRIT AND LETTER OF FAR SECTION 91.3A AND 91.3B.

Synopsis :

A PA28 TRAINING FLT DEPARTED THEIR HOLDING PATTERN FIX WITHOUT AUTH FROM ATC WHEN CONFLICTING TFC LEFT FEW OPTIONS. FREQ CONGESTION AT EUG, OR.

Time

Date : 199909
Day : Mon
Local Time Of Day : 1801 To 2400

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : DAB.Airport
State Reference : FL
Altitude.MSL.Bound Lower : 2000
Altitude.MSL.Bound Upper : 2500

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.TRACON : DAB.TRACON
Make Model : PA-34-200 Seneca I

Aircraft / 2

Controlling Facilities.TRACON : DAB.TRACON
Make Model : M-20 Scotsman

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Instructor
Experience.Flight Time.Total : 1456
Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 157
Experience.Flight Time.Type : 66
ASRS Report : 449968

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee
Experience.Flight Time.Total : 560

Person / 3

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Person / 4

Function.Controller : Approach

Events

Anomaly.Altitude Deviation : Excursion From Assigned Altitude
Anomaly.Conflict : Airborne Less Severe
Anomaly.Non Adherence : Clearance
Anomaly.Non Adherence : Required Legal Separation
Independent Detector.Other.ControllerA : 4
Resolatory Action.Flight Crew : Took Precautionary Avoidance Action
Resolatory Action.Controller : Issued Advisory
Consequence.FAA : Reviewed Incident With Flight Crew
Consequence.Other : Emotional Trauma

Supplementary

Problem Areas : ATC Human Performance
Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

ON SEP/XA/99, MY STUDENT AND I WERE COMING BACK FROM AN MEI DUAL FLT. MY INST RATED STUDENT EXPRESSED THAT HE WANTED TO FLY THE ILS RWY 7L INTO DAB. I RADIOED DAYTONA APCH AND RECEIVED OUR IFR CLRNC. CLRED DAB VIA RADAR VECTORS, ALT 3000 FT. HE CONTINUED FLYING AND TOOK OVER THE RADIOS. I SET MY NOTEPAD, WHICH I USE TO COPY HDGS AND ALTS, ON THE FLOOR AND PAID SPECIAL ATTN TO HIS APCH PROCS FOR THE SENECA. APCH CLRED US FROM 3000 FT TO 2500 FT AND REQUESTED OUR ALT. MY STUDENT RESPONDED THAT WE WERE AT 3000 FT BUT DIDN'T READ THE ALT WE WERE CLRED TO. I DISAGREED WITH HIS USE OF THE RADIOS AT THAT TIME BUT SAID NOTHING BECAUSE WE WERE IN VFR CONDITIONS. I CONTINUED LOOKING OUT FOR TFC AND GLANCED AT THE ALTIMETER. IT READ 2000 FT. I TOLD HIM WE WERE CLRED TO 2500 FT AND WE SHOULD CLB BACK UP TO THAT ASSIGNED ALT. HE INSISTED WE WERE CLRED TO 1600 FT. I PHYSICALLY HELD THE YOKE BACK TO HOLD 2000 FT. WHEN APCH CAME BACK AND ASKED OUR ALT, MY STUDENT SAID 2000 FT. SHE NEVER CORRECTED HIM, SO I SECOND-GUESSED MY EARLIER RECOLLECTION OF OUR 2500 FT ALT RESTR. THE CTLR TOLD US THERE WAS OTHER TFC IN THE AREA WHICH I TOLD MY STUDENT I HAD IN SIGHT AND HE PASSED THAT ON TO APCH. IT FLEW WELL CLR OF OUR PLANE. THE CTLR THEN CLRED US FOR THE APCH. I DIDN'T HEAR THE CLRNC, BUT MY STUDENT READ IT BACK AND CLAIMED TO HAVE UNDERSTOOD. MY STUDENT FLEW THE APCH, LANDED, AND WAS INSTRUCTED TO CALL TWR ASAP. I CALLED. THEY WERE UNHAPPY AND I COMPLETELY UNDERSTOOD. THE ACFT WAS AT 1600 FT AND WE WERE AT 2000 FT. BOTH OF US WERE ON AN IFR CLRNC AND BECAUSE OF OUR ALTDEV, APCH WAS NOT ABLE TO KEEP THE MANDATORY 1000 FT VERT CLRNC. I JUST WISH THEY HAD A RECORDING OF WHAT WENT ON IN THE COCKPIT. IT WAS MY LAST FLT OF A VERY LONG DAY. MY STUDENT WAS A CFI WITH 560 HRS AND HE WAS MY BEST STUDENT. HIS CONFIDENT DEMEANOR MADE ME SECOND-GUESS WHAT I REALLY HEARD. THE ALTDEV TAUGHT ME THE TRUE LIABILITY OF A FLT INSTRUCTOR AND HAS LED ME AWAY FROM THE PROFESSION. I AM SEEKING OTHER AVENUES OF HR BUILDING WHERE ANOTHER PERSON'S MISTAKE CAN NOT THREATEN MY PLT CERTIFICATE. I FEAR FOR MY CO-WORKERS AND THE HRS REQUIRED TO 'PAY THE BILLS.' IT IS VERY COMMON FOR THE CFI'S IN THIS AREA TO PUT IN 13-14 HR DAYS JUST TO EARN 4-6 HRS OF REVENUE. THIS RESULTS IN HIGH FATIGUE ON THE LAST FLT OF THE DAY. I'M NOT THE FIRST TO EXPRESS THIS CONCERN AND I WON'T BE THE LAST. I AM JUST GLAD TO BE MOVING ON TO A SAFER AVIATION RELATED FIELD.

Synopsis :

2 CFI'S IN A PA34 HAVE A POTENTIAL CONFLICT WITH A MOONEY WHILE EXPERIENCING AN ALTDEV DURING AN INITIAL APCH TO DAB, FL.

ACN: 452207

Time

Date : 199910

Day : Fri

Local Time Of Day : 1201 To 1800

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : MJX.Airport

State Reference : NJ

Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Make Model : PA-28 Cherokee/Archer Ii/Dakota/Pillan/Warrior

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 2500

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 60

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 2000

ASRS Report : 452207

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Person / 3

Function.Observation : Air Carrier Inspector

Events

Anomaly.Non Adherence : FAR

Resolatory Action.None Taken : Anomaly Accepted

Consequence.FAA : Investigated

Consequence.FAA : Reviewed Incident With Flight Crew

Supplementary

Problem Areas : FAA

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

RAMP CHK. AT AB00 FAA INSPECTOR PHL FSDO ASKED FOR MY FLYING CREDENTIALS. I TOLD FAA INSPECTOR THAT I THOUGHT THIS WAS A GOV FLT AND OUT OF THE FAA JURISDICTION. FAA INSPECTOR ASKED STUDENT (ACTIVE DUTY SECOND LIEUTENANT) FOR ORDERS TO FLT TRAIN. AS AN FAA SAFETY COUNSELOR, I AM AWARE OF RAMP CHK OBLIGATIONS. AFTER FAA ASKED STUDENT IF HIS ACTIVE DUTY STATUS WAS REAL, THE SECOND LIEUTENANT (STUDENT) SAID IT WAS HIS MISSION TO FLY AND TRAIN. FAA IS INVESTIGATING THIS AS A FAILURE TO CHK CREDENTIALS, BUT I BELIEVE THIS WAS/IS A GOV FLT. FAA INSPECTOR THEN STEPPED BACK AND SAID HE KNEW WHO I WAS AND MENTIONED MY NAME. HE SAID HE WOULD CALL OCT/XA/99 TO VERIFY INFO.

Synopsis :

A PA28-161 FLT INSTRUCTOR REFUSES TO DISPLAY HIS CREDENTIALS TO AN FAA INSPECTOR ON THE GROUNDS THAT HIS AERO CLUB ACTIVITIES WERE A GOV FLT OR OP AND OUTSIDE THE JURISDICTION OF THE FAA.

ACN: 453164

Time

Date : 199910

Day : Thu

Local Time Of Day : 1201 To 1800

Place

State Reference : NY

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 2000

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.TRACON : N90.TRACON

Make Model : Sport 19

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 3400

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 200

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 300

ASRS Report : 453164

Person / 2

Function.Controller : Approach

Person / 3

Function.Controller : Approach

Person / 4

Function.Controller : Local

Events

Anomaly.Non Adherence : Published Procedure

Independent Detector.Other.ControllerA : 3

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1

Resolatory Action.Controller : Issued New Clearance

Supplementary

Problem Areas : ATC Human Performance

Narrative :

ON A TRAINING FLT FROM LONG ISLAND MACARTHUR ARPT (ISP) TO FARMINGDALE REPUBLIC ARPT (FRG) WITH A STUDENT I CALLED NEW YORK APCH AFTER BEING XFERRED BY LONG ISLAND TWR WITH A 270 DEG HDG. THIS IS USUAL ROUTINE. I REQUESTED A PRACTICE ILS INTO FRG. NEW YORK APCH CONFIRMED THE HEADING AND CONFIRMED US AT 2000 FT ALT, AS PREVIOUSLY CLRED BY TWR. THE TFC WAS UNUSUALLY BUSY, EVEN FOR LONG ISLAND. LATER ON, LONG AFTER WE HAD PASSED S OF DPK VOR, WE WERE XFERRED TO ANOTHER FREQ WITH...STAY CLR OF CLASS D AIRSPACE. I GLANCED AT THE GPS (M3, IFR APCH APPROVAL) AND READ FRG4.1. WE WERE INSIDE CLASS D AIRSPACE AND OBVIOUSLY NEW YORK APCH HAD MISSED IT UNTIL IT WAS TOO LATE AND THEN DROPPED THE MONKEY ON OUR BACK. THE NEW FREQ WAS VERY BUSY AND FOR OVER 1 MIN I COULD NOT SAY A WORD. MY LAST ATC INSTRUCTIONS BEING: 1) FLY 270 DEG HDG AND MAINTAIN 2000 FT (AND MAINTAIN VFR AT ALL TIMES). 2) STAY CLR OF CLASS D AIRSPACE (AFTER BEING VECTORED INTO IT) AND NO VECTOR. WHEN NEW YORK APCH CAME BACK TO US WE WERE 3.5 MI FROM FRG, CAREFULLY MONITORING ALL TFC AROUND US. WE WERE INFORMED THAT WE WERE IN CLASS D AIRSPACE, WHICH WE KNEW AND ATC KNEW WHEN THEY VECTORED US. AFTER A FEW NEW VECTORS WE FLEW AN UNEVENTFUL APCH TO A LNDG. FRG TWR NEVER MADE A COMMENT. WHEN ATC ISSUES VECTORS THEY MUST BE COMPLIED WITH UNLESS A NEW CLRNC CAN BE OBTAINED (EXCEPT WHEN SAFETY IS REALLY AT RISK). THERE WAS NO WAY WE COULD ASK FOR ANY NEW CLRNC ON THE CROWDED FREQ, EITHER BEFORE OR AFTER THE SWITCH BTWN THE 2 SECTORS. THE CLRNC WAS OBVIOUSLY A MISTAKE BUT WAS NOT UNSAFE SINCE WE HAD A GOOD VISIBILITY. OUR CHOICE WAS VIOLATION FOR NON COMPLIANCE WITH A CLRNC, OR VIOLATION FOR ENTERING CLASS D AIRSPACE WITHOUT RADIO CONTACT. I UNDERSTAND THAT WE ALL MAKE MISTAKES, BUT WHY NOT VECTOR US OUT OF CLASS D AND RESUME NORMAL OPS? WHY STAY CLR AFTER WE HAD ENTERED IT? SINCE THIS CLASS D IS PARTIALLY INSIDE CLASS B WE ASSUMED THAT THE CTLRS WERE IN TOUCH, IN A MANNER SIMILAR TO THE XFER BTWN APCH AND TWR AROUND THE OM. EITHER WAY, UNTIL WE COULD GET AN AMENDED CLRNC WE HAD NO CHOICE BUT BE WRONG. SHOULDN'T ATC HAVE SOME RESPONSIBILITY? BY THE WAY THIS SIT IS VERY UNUSUAL, NY APCH IS MOST OF THE TIME OUTSTANDING. I THINK THAT CORRECTING A MISTAKE RATHER THAN DROPPING IT ON THE PLT WOULD BE A SAFER AND HEALTHIER ATTITUDE.

Synopsis :

PLT VFR AT FRG RECEIVING VECTORS FOR PRACTICE ILS APCH IS TOLD BY THE CTLR THAT HE HAD ENTERED CLASS D AIRSPACE.

Time

Date : 199910

Day : Sun

Local Time Of Day : 1201 To 1800

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : UES.Airport

State Reference : WI

Altitude.AGL.Bound Lower : 0

Altitude.AGL.Bound Upper : 3

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.Tower : UES.Tower

Make Model : Champion Citabria 7eca

Aircraft / 2

Controlling Facilities.Tower : UES.Tower

Make Model : Citation

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 1700

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 240

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 250

ASRS Report : 453252

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 4000

Person / 3

Function.Controller : Local

Person / 4

Function.Oversight : PIC

Function.Flight Crew : Captain

Events

Anomaly.Inflight Encounter : Wake Turbulence

Anomaly.Other Anomaly : Loss Of Aircraft Control

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1

Resolatory Action.None Taken : Unable

Consequence.FAA : Investigated

Consequence.FAA : Reviewed Incident With Flight Crew

Consequence.Other : Aircraft Damaged

Consequence.Other : Maintenance Action

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Aircraft

Problem Areas : Environmental Factor

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

I WAS TRAINING A PLT IN A 7ECA CITABRIA FOR A TAILWHEEL CHKOUT. HE WAS A 4000 HR CFI WITH 25 YRS FLING EXPERIENCE. THIS WAS HIS SECOND LESSON IN A TAILWHEEL. OUR SECOND LNDG WAS A FULL STALL LNDG, FOLLOWED BY A GAR. PWR CAME IN, TAIL UP, AND JUST AFTER LIFTOFF ACFT BEGAN TO BANK R. I CAME ON THE CTLS, BUT THE AIRPLANE DID NOT RESPOND AND BANKED VIOLENTLY TO THE R, RESULTING IN A CRASH 50 FT TO THE R OF THE RWY. POSSIBLE CAUSE; 1) STUDENT PUSHED FULL R RUDDER, AND I WAS UNABLE TO OVERPOWER HIM. HOWEVER, STUDENT WAS A CFI WITH 4000 HRS AND 25 HRS EXPERIENCE. I WOULD NOT EXPECT HIM TO DO SOMETHING LIKE THAT. IT WAS ALSO NOT A GNDLOOP -- AIRPLANE WAS AIRBORNE BEFORE ANY PROBS AROSE. 2) WINDSHEAR, BUT WINDS WERE STEADY AND LIGHT 270 DEGS AT 7 KTS. 3) WAKE TURB FROM JET THAT HAD LANDED 4 MINS PRIOR. THIS SCENARIO WOULD WORK WITH THE L XWIND AND THE LIGHT WINDS, BUT NOT THE HEADWIND COMPONENT, NOR THE FACT THAT IT WAS A 500 SERIES CITATION, WHICH DOESN'T SEEM TO GENERATE MUCH WAKE. CALLBACK CONVERSATION WITH RPTR REVEALED THE FOLLOWING INFO: RPTR INDICATES THAT HE HAS HAD LONG DISCUSSIONS WITH THE FAA AND THEY HAVE COME TO NO DEFINITIVE CONCLUSION ABOUT THE ACTUAL CAUSE. THE ACFT WAS DAMAGED INCLUDING THE GEAR AND PROP AND SOME BELLY DAMAGE. NOT CONSIDERED SUBSTANTIAL UNLESS YOU ARE WRITING THE CHKS FOR REPAIRS. THE ACFT CAME TO REST 90 DEGS TO THE RWY.

Synopsis :

CITABRIA ATTAINS 3 FT OF ALT ON TKOF, TURNS 90 DEGS AND LANDS NEXT TO THE RWY IN SPITE OF INSTRUCTOR'S BEST EFFORTS.

Time

Date : 199910

Day : Mon

Local Time Of Day : 1801 To 2400

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : ESN.Airport

State Reference : MD

Altitude.AGL.Bound Lower : 0

Altitude.AGL.Bound Upper : 75

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Make Model : M-20 J (201)

Component / 1

Aircraft Component : Landing Gear

Aircraft Reference : X

Problem : Improperly Operated

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 1560

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 46

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 400

ASRS Report : 435353

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Events

Anomaly.Aircraft Equipment Problem : Critical

Anomaly.Non Adherence : Published Procedure

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewB : 2

Resolutory Action.None Taken : Detected After The Fact

Consequence.Other : Aircraft Damaged

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

2 PLTS WERE ON BOARD THE INCIDENT FLT. THERE WERE NO OTHER ACFT INVOLVED OR EVEN IN THE VICINITY. I WAS ACTING AS FLT INSTRUCTOR (I AM A CFI-IA). I WAS CONDUCTING A FLT REVIEW WITH THE OTHER PLT WHO IS AN INST RATED PVT PLT AND WHO HAS MANY HUNDRED OF HRS IN THE M20. IT WAS NIGHTTIME, THE WX WAS CLR AND THERE WAS BRIGHT MOONLIGHT. IN PREPARATION FOR A LNDG ON RWY 22 AT ESN, I HAD OBSERVED THE PF PERFORM THE PRELNDG CHK AND I CONFIRMED THEN THAT THE LNDG GEAR WAS DOWN. WHEN THE FLT WAS ON SHORT FINAL FOR RWY 22 I AGAIN CONFIRMED THAT THE LNDG GEAR WAS DOWN. AT ABOUT 1/2 MI FROM THE APCH END OF THE RWY, I SAID 'YOU CAN MAKE A TOUCH-AND-GO OR A FULL STOP.' THE PF EXECUTED A GAR. IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE PF ESTABLISHED A CLB ATTITUDE WITH FULL PWR, I RETARDED THE THROTTLE TO SIMULATE A LOSS OF PWR ON TKOF/GAR. AT THAT MOMENT THE ACFT WAS AT ABOUT 75 FT AGL AND 85 KIAS. THE PF IMMEDIATELY LOWERED THE NOSE TO MAINTAIN FLYING SPD AND THEN ESTABLISHED A SPD APPROPRIATE FOR LNDG (ABOUT 70-75 KIAS). HE MAINTAINED EXCELLENT LATERAL CTL AND AIRSPD CTL WITH THE THROTTLE AT IDLE. I BELIEVE I SPLIT MY TIME BTWN OBSERVING THE AIRSPD INDICATOR AND THE ACFT'S ATTITUDE, AND JUDGING IF THERE WAS SUFFICIENT REMAINING RWY TO LAND. ALTHOUGH I OBSERVED THE PF LOWER THE FLAPS TO FULL, I FAILED TO CHK THAT THE LNDG GEAR WAS STILL EXTENDED. THE PROP AND THEN PARTS OF THE UNDERSIDE OF THE ACFT STRUCK THE RWY, THE ENG STOPPED, AND THE ACFT SLID TO A STOP DIRECTLY ON THE CTRLINE OF THE RWY ABOUT 1000 FT FROM THE END OF RWY 22. THE 2 PLTS SHUT OFF THE FUEL, ENG, IGNITION AND ELECTRICAL SYS AND SWITCHES AND EXITED THE ACFT WITHIN LESS THAN 30 SECONDS. AFTER A FEW MOMENTS WE OBSERVED THAT THERE WAS NO SIGN OR SMELL OF FUEL, AND WE SAW THAT THE WINGS HAD NEVER TOUCHED THE GND (WE HAD 1 FLASHLIGHT AT THIS POINT). A FEW MINS LATER WE RETURNED TO THE ACFT TO CONFIRM THAT THE ACFT WAS PROPERLY SHUT DOWN AND TO RETRIEVE ADDITIONAL FLASHLIGHTS AND A HAND-HELD TRANSCEIVER. ASAP WE CONTACTED THE POLICE/FIRE AUTHS (VIA 911) AND THE ARPT MGR, NOTIFYING THEM OF THE INCIDENT AND STATING THAT RWY 22 WAS BLOCKED. WE MONITORED THE ESN UNICOM FREQ TO NOTIFY ANY ACFT THAT RWY 22 WAS CLOSED (NONE APCHED OR DEPARTED) UNTIL THE ARPT AUTHS ARRIVED AND OUR ACFT WAS REMOVED. I BELIEVE THAT ALMOST EVERY ACCIDENT/INCIDENT IS THE RESULT OF A DEFINITE CHAIN OF EVENTS. WHILE MOST EVENTS OCCUR IN A SEQUENTIAL ORDER, SOME RUN PARALLEL. PROPER ACTION AT ANY ONE OF THE KEY LINKS WILL ALMOST ALWAYS BREAK THE CHAIN AND THE ACCIDENT/INCIDENT WILL NOT OCCUR. ALTHOUGH THE CHAIN OF EVENTS IN THE ABOVE INCIDENT APPEARS TO BE RELATIVELY SHORT, BOTH IN TIME AND IN SEQUENCE, IT STILL REQUIRED SEVERAL DISTINCT LAPSES ON MY PART BEFORE I WOUND UP AT THE WRONG END OF THAT CHAIN. PROPER ACTION BY ME ANYWHERE OR ANYTIME ALONG THE CHAIN WOULD HAVE KEPT ME AND MY STUDENT OFF THE ASPHALT THAT EVENING. HOW THE PROB AROSE: I USED BAD JUDGEMENT BY SIMULATING AN ENG-OUT EMER AT NIGHT. IT WAS ALSO POOR JUDGEMENT TO SIMULATE AN EMER FOLLOWING THE PF'S GAR. IT WAS OBVIOUS THAT HE WAS UNCERTAIN ABOUT SOMETHING, AND MY ADDING A SIMULATED EMER MUST HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO HIS UNCERTAINTY. THE FINAL, AND MOST INEXCUSABLE, LINK IN THIS CHAIN WAS MY FAILURE TO CHK THAT THE LNDG GEAR WAS DOWN. CONTRIBUTING FACTORS: HUMAN PERFORMANCE CONSIDERATIONS: CONTRIBUTING FACTORS AFFECTING THE QUALITY OF PERCEPTIONS, JUDGEMENTS AND DECISIONS: IN RETROSPECT, MY PERCEPTIONS, JUDGEMENTS AND DECISIONS WERE INFLUENCED BY THE FOLLOWING CONTRIBUTING FACTORS, BUT THEY DO NOT IN ANY WAY EXCUSE MY ACTIONS OR INACTIONS: 1) THE PF IS ONE OF THE BETTER, SAFEST PLTS I FLY WITH. I WOULD NOT SIMULATE AN ENG FAILURE ON TKOF, AT NIGHT OR DURING THE DAY, WITH MOST OF THE PLTS I FLY WITH. I DID SO IN THIS CASE BECAUSE I BELIEVED THE PF WOULD BE ABLE TO HANDLE THE TRANSITION FROM A FULL PWR CLB TO A PWR OFF GLIDE AND LNDG. 2) I WAS NOT TERRIBLY CONCERNED THAT IT WAS NIGHT BECAUSE THE VISIBILITY WAS SUPERB AND THERE WAS A VERY BRIGHT (ALMOST FULL) MOON. 3) I WAS UNDER THE FALSE IMPRESSION/PERCEPTION THAT THE LNDG GEAR WAS DOWN. I HAD CHKED THAT THE LNDG GEAR WAS DOWN JUST A FEW MOMENTS BEFORE THE GAR. I DID NOT SEE THE PF RAISE THE LNDG GEAR, BUT I DID SEE HIM LOWER THE FLAPS. MOREOVER, SINCE I HAD REDUCED THE THROTTLE IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE PF HAD ESTABLISHED A CLB, I DID NOT ANTICIPATE THAT HE WOULD HAVE RAISED THE GEAR. THIS WAS THE KEY, THOUGH FALSE, IMPRESSION/PERCEPTION, THAT MAY HAVE CAUSED ME NOT TO RECHK THAT THE LNDG GEAR WAS DOWN. ALL OF THESE THOUGHTS AND INACTIONS WERE INCORRECT. THE LNDG GEAR POS WAS, OF COURSE, DISPLAYED ON THE ANNUNCIATOR PANEL AT ALL TIMES THROUGHOUT THIS INCIDENT.

Synopsis :

AN INSTRUCTOR AND FLT REVIEW PLT LANDED A MOONEY M20 WITH THE GEAR UP AT ESN.

Time

Date : 199910
Day : Sun
Local Time Of Day : 0601 To 1200

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : CCR.Airport
State Reference : CA
Altitude.MSL.Bound Lower : 720
Altitude.MSL.Bound Upper : 960

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.Tower : CCR.Tower
Make Model : PA-28 Cherokee/Archer II/Dakota/Pillan/Warrior

Aircraft / 2

Controlling Facilities.Tower : CCR.Tower
Make Model : Bonanza 33

Person / 1

Function.Oversight : PIC
Function.Instruction : Instructor
Experience.Flight Time.Total : 28500
Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 190
Experience.Flight Time.Type : 400
ASRS Report : 453484

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Person / 3

Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot

Person / 4

Function.Controller : Local

Events

Anomaly.Conflict : NMAC
Anomaly.Non Adherence : FAR
Anomaly.Non Adherence : Published Procedure
Anomaly.Non Adherence : Required Legal Separation
Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1
Resolatory Action.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action

Supplementary

Problem Areas : ATC Human Performance
Problem Areas : FAA
Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

TKOF RWY 32L. AT 723 FT, L TURN TO ABOUT 140 DEGS (THIS IS A CLBING L TURN). AT COMPLETION OF TURN, STUDENT ROLLED STRAIGHT TO HDG OF 140 DEGS (FOR UPWIND LEG). AT THAT MOMENT, 3 THINGS HAPPENED ALL AT THE SAME TIME: 1) IN MY WINDSHIELD SIDE AND FORWARD SIDE WINDOW WAS A V-TAILED BONANZA ACFT Y. 2) I FORCED THE CTL WHEEL OVER SHARPLY, ANNOUNCING THAT I HAD THE ACFT. 3) I RETARDED ALL PWR TO IDLE. THE BEECHCRAFT NEVER MOVED AN INCH UP, DOWN, OR SIDEWAYS. I CALLED TWR. THEY WERE VERY NON COMMITTAL. WE PASSED DIRECTLY UNDER THE BEECHCRAFT ABOUT 40 FT. THE BEECHCRAFT AT MIDFIELD STARTED HIS/HER DSCNT THROUGH THE HELI PATTERN, LANDED, AND TAXIED TO THE RAMP. I ATTEMPTED TO GET THE FULL CALL SIGN FROM THE TWR. THEY REFUSED. WHAT CONCERNS ME IS THERE WAS NO CALL BY ACFT Y THAT WE HEARD. IF THEY CALLED FOR ENTRY INTO A CLASS D, TWR NEVER INFORMED US. ACFT Y MADE STRAIGHT-IN ENTRY (NO 45 DEG) INTO OUR 90 DEG TURN TO THE L FROM RWY HDG. OUR LOW WING PA28-161 WAS 'BELLY UP' TO THE BONANZA ACFT Y. THEY HAD TO HAVE SEEN US AS WE WERE BTWN THEM AND THE RWY ON DOWNWIND, THE BONANZA WAS NOT LOOKING FOR TFC (US). MIDFIELD, THE BONANZA DSNDDED INTO THE HELI PATTERN.

Synopsis :

INSTRUCTOR HAS AN NMAC IN THE TFC PATTERN AT CCR. COMPLAINS THAT THIS IS A RECURRING PROB.

Time

Date : 199910

Day : Tue

Local Time Of Day : 1201 To 1800

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : CAK.Airport

State Reference : OH

Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.Tower : CAK.Tower

Make Model : Learjet 35

Aircraft / 2

Controlling Facilities.Tower : CAK.Tower

Make Model : Learjet 24

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Function.Controller : Clearance Delivery

Function.Controller : Ground

ASRS Report : 453492

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Function.Controller : Clearance Delivery

Function.Controller : Ground

Person / 3

Function.Oversight : PIC

Function.Flight Crew : Captain

Person / 4

Function.Oversight : PIC

Function.Flight Crew : Captain

Events

Anomaly.Conflict : Ground Less Severe

Anomaly.Non Adherence : Published Procedure

Independent Detector.Other.ControllerA : 1

Resolatory Action.Controller : Issued New Clearance

Resolatory Action.Controller : Separated Traffic

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Airport

Problem Areas : ATC Human Performance

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

ACFT #1 WAS GIVEN A TAXI CLRNC TO RWY 23 AFTER HE RPTED HIS POS WAS AT FBO-1. FBO-1 IS AN FBO AT ZZZ ARPT. IT IS LOCATED ON THE E SIDE OF THE AIRFIELD. THE APCH END OF RWY 23 IS ALSO LOCATED ON THE NE END OF THE FIELD. THERE ARE NO OTHER RWYS TO CROSS BTWN FBO-1 AND RWY 23. TXWY E PARALLELS THE RAMP AREA THAT LEADS INTO FBO-1 AND IS THE TXWY THAT LEADS TO THE APCH END OF RWY 23. ANOTHER ACFT THAT WAS GIVEN TAXI INSTRUCTIONS FROM FBO-1 TO RWY 23, WAS INSTRUCTED TO FOLLOW ACFT #1 (LR35) TO RWY 23. AT THIS TIME ACFT #1 INDICATED HE WAS ON THE W SIDE OF THE ARPT. ACFT #1 WAS INSTRUCTED IMMEDIATELY TO 'HOLD SHORT OF RWY 19 AT TXWY H.' ACFT #1 WAS OBSERVED JUST ENTERING ONTO TXWY H. HOWEVER, THERE WAS ANOTHER LEARJET (ACFT #2) DEPARTING RWY 19. BECAUSE OF ACFT #1'S ERRONEOUS POS RPT AND BECAUSE OF THE ZZZ ARPT'S MGMNT FAILURE TO TAKE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING, THE POTENTIAL EXISTS FOR A CATASTROPHE. THERE WAS NO LOSS OF SEPARATION THIS TIME, BUT I BELIEVE THE POTENTIAL EXISTS EVERYDAY! FBO-1 IS AN FBO ON THE E SIDE OF CAK ARPT. THIS IS USUALLY REFERRED TO AS FBO E. THIS IS BECAUSE AT ONE TIME, FBO-1 WAS ALSO LOCATED ON THE WNW SIDE OF THE FIELD. THIS ONE NO LONGER EXISTS. THE FBO ON THE W SIDE NOW IS 'FBO-2.' IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING ACFT USING 'FBO-2' ARE INSTRUCTED TO SAY 'FBO-2' WHEN ASKED THEIR POS AND THERE ARE ALSO SIGNS INSTRUCTING THEM ALSO. HOWEVER, IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING THERE ARE SIGNS WITH 'FBO-1' ON THEM, STILL IN VIEW ON THE W SIDE. THESE 'OLD' SIGNS MISLEAD PLTS AS TO THEIR POS AND AS IN THE CASE BE GIVEN WRONG TAXI INSTRUCTIONS.

Synopsis :

ZZZ DEVELOPMENTAL CTLR RECOGNIZES TAXIING ACFT HAS RPTED TAXIING FROM AN INCORRECTLY IDENTED ARPT FBO AND CORRECTS CLRNC TO HOLD SHORT OF RWY FOR DEPARTING TFC.

Time

Date : 199910

Day : Wed

Local Time Of Day : 1201 To 1800

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : SBP.Airport

State Reference : CA

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 4000

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.ARTCC : ZLA.ARTCC

Make Model : PA-28 Cherokee/Archer II/Dakota/Pillan/Warrior

Person / 1

Function.Oversight : PIC

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 8150

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 300

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 3000

ASRS Report : 453508

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Person / 3

Function.Controller : Approach

Events

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1

Resolatory Action.None Taken : Anomaly Accepted

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Chart Or Publication

Narrative :

WHILE IN THE PUBLISHED HOLDING PATTERN AT CREPE INTXN, ZLA CLRED US FOR THE ILS RWY 11 AT SBP. WE WERE FLYING THE PATTERN AT 4000 FT, AND AS SOON AS CLRNC GIVEN, MY STUDENT ASKED IF HE COULD DSND TO THE 2400 FT GS INTERCEPT ALT. I LOOKED AT HIS GOV APCH PLATE AND SAW THE 2400 FT ARROW WAS LINED UP WITH THE HOLDING PATTERN ALT. THIS IS DIFFERENT FROM THE PROFILES AS SHOWN ON COMMERCIAL CHART MAKER PRODUCTS. SEE THE ENCLOSED COPIES COMPARING THE COMMERCIAL CHART AND GOV CHARTS. THE GOV CHART SHOWS NO DIFFERENCE IN ALTS ON THE PROFILE, EVEN THOUGH IT EXISTS! A 'PROFILE' MUST DEPICT A 'PROFILE.'

Synopsis :

FLT INSTRUCTOR NOTICES DIFFERENCE IN PRESENTATION OF PROFILE FOR ILS RWY 11 APCH AT SAN LUIS OBISPO, CA.

ACN: 453770

Time

Date : 199911

Day : Thu

Local Time Of Day : 0601 To 1200

Place

State Reference : CA

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 1000

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Make Model : PA-28 Cherokee/Archer II/Dakota/Pillan/Warrior

Person / 1

Function.Oversight : PIC

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 845

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 130

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 300

ASRS Report : 453770

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot

Person / 3

Function.Controller : Approach

Events

Anomaly.Other Spatial Deviation : Track Or Heading Deviation

Anomaly.Airspace Violation : Entry

Anomaly.Non Adherence : FAR

Anomaly.Non Adherence : Published Procedure

Resolatory Action.Flight Crew : Became Reoriented

Resolatory Action.Flight Crew : Returned To Assigned Airspace

Resolatory Action.Controller : Issued Alert

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

WHILE PREPARING A STUDENT FOR HIS PVT PLT CHK RIDE, WE WERE DOING GND REF MANEUVERS CLOSE TO NAS LEMOORE (MY NORMAL PRACTICE AREA FOR STUDENTS) ON THE S SIDE OF CLASS D AIRSPACE, AND CALLED FOR ADVISORIES AND WAS ADVISED MY ACFT WAS JUST INSIDE THE NAS LEMOORE CLASS D SVC AREA. WE QUICKLY REALIZED THE MISTAKE AND PROMPTLY EXITED SBOUND. CONTRIBUTING FACTORS NOT MAINTAINING POSITIONAL AWARENESS WHILE IN REDUCED VISIBILITY (3 MI). ANOTHER CORRECTIVE ACTION MIGHT BE GETTING ADVISORY SVCS JUST AFTER DEPARTING VISALIA WESTWARD INTO THE PRACTICE AREA.

Synopsis :

PA28 INSTRUCTOR AND TRAINEE PENETRATED NLC CLASS D.

ACN: 454010

Time

Date : 199911

Day : Tue

Local Time Of Day : 1201 To 1800

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : CCR.Airport

State Reference : CA

Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 1000

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.Tower : CCR.Tower

Make Model : PA-28 Cherokee/Archer II/Dakota/Pillan/Warrior

Aircraft / 2

Controlling Facilities.Tower : CCR.Tower

Make Model : Skyhawk 172/Cutlass 172

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 1300

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 150

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 150

ASRS Report : 454010

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Person / 3

Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot

Person / 4

Function.Controller : Local

Events

Anomaly.Conflict : Airborne Less Severe

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1

Resolatory Action.Flight Crew : Took Precautionary Avoidance Action

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

ON APCH TO LNDG AT CCR, R TFC FOR RWY 32R. DIFFICULT TO SEE IN HAZE AT DUSK. SAW C172 IN FRONT OF US (WE WERE #2 BEHIND THEM) AND ELECTED TO DO A 360 DEG L TURN FOR SPACING. TOLD TWR WHAT WE NEEDED TO DO AS WE STARTED INTO TURN. TWR THEN APPROVED MANEUVER. ON REFLECTION, I SHOULD HAVE TOLD STUDENT TO WIDEN OUT OUR BASE RATHER THAN DO A 360 DEG AND ASK FOR APPROVAL, BUT IT WAS DUSK, HARD TO SEE IN THE HAZE, AND I NEEDED TO STAY AWAY FROM ACFT I COULDN'T SEE WELL WHICH SLOWED DOWN QUICKLY.

Synopsis :

AN INSTRUCTOR AND STUDENT PLT CLOSED ON A CESSNA 172 IN THE TFC PATTERN AT CCR.

Time

Date : 199911

Day : Wed

Local Time Of Day : 0001 To 0600

Place

State Reference : SD

Altitude.MSL.Bound Lower : 0

Altitude.MSL.Bound Upper : 6000

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Make Model : Centurion/Turbo Centurion 210c

Component / 1

Aircraft Component : Fuel Storage System

Aircraft Reference : X

Problem : Improperly Operated

Problem : Malfunctioning

Person / 1

Function.Oversight : PIC

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 16000

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 100

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 800

ASRS Report : 454023

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Events

Anomaly.Aircraft Equipment Problem : Critical

Anomaly.Non Adherence : Published Procedure

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1

Resolutory Action.Flight Crew : Landed In Emergency Condition

Consequence.Other : Aircraft Damaged

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Aircraft

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

ON A NIGHT TRAINING FLT, FILED FOR 4 1/2 HRS, WITH FULL FUEL (ENOUGH FOR 5 HRS, 15 MINS). DSNDRG INTO DEST FIELD, AT APPROX 6000 FT, THE ACFT RAN OUT OF FUEL. THE DURATION OF THE FLT WAS 4.4 HRS ACCORDING TO THE ACFT HOBBS METER. THE ACFT WAS FULL OF FUEL WHEN I DEPARTED AND THERE SHOULD HAVE BEEN 45 MINS OF FUEL REMAINING AT TIME OF ACCIDENT. I HAD FLOWN THIS ACFT ON THE PREVIOUS FLT FOR 4.3 HRS AND USED 75 GALS OF FUEL. THE ACFT WAS FLOWN IDENTICALLY TO THE PRIOR FLT, BUT SOMEHOW, USED 12 GALS MORE FUEL THAN ESTIMATED. THE ACFT OPERATOR'S MANUAL, AND MY EXTENSIVE EXPERIENCE FLYING THIS ACFT SHOWS THAT THERE SHOULD HAVE BEEN ADEQUATE FUEL. SUGGEST THAT ALL FUTURE FLTS SHOULD BE LIMITED TO 4 HRS, IRRESPECTIVE OF WHAT THE BOOK SAYS, OR THE FUEL GAUGES. LANDED GEAR UP, JUST SHORT OF THE RWY BECAUSE THAT WAS AS FAR AS IT WOULD GLIDE.

Synopsis :

A VERY EXPERIENCED ACR PLT, IN A CT210, DURING A NIGHT TRAINING FLT, RAN OUT OF FUEL AND LANDED GEAR UP.

Time

Date : 199911
Day : Mon
Local Time Of Day : 1201 To 1800

Place

State Reference : LA
Altitude.MSL.Bound Lower : 244
Altitude.MSL.Bound Upper : 300

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Make Model : Golden Eagle 421

Aircraft / 2

Make Model : Cessna Single Piston Undifferentiated or Other Model

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Instructor
Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot
Experience.Flight Time.Total : 4900
Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 60
Experience.Flight Time.Type : 450
ASRS Report : 453340

Person / 2

Function.Oversight : PIC
Function.Instruction : Trainee
Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot
Experience.Flight Time.Total : 2448
Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 53
Experience.Flight Time.Type : 350
ASRS Report : 454329

Person / 3

Function.Oversight : PIC
Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot

Person / 4

Function.Controller : Approach

Events

Anomaly.Conflict : Airborne Less Severe
Anomaly.Non Adherence : Company Policies
Anomaly.Non Adherence : FAR
Anomaly.Non Adherence : Published Procedure
Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 3
Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewB : 947
Resolutory Action.Controller : Separated Traffic

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Airspace Structure
Problem Areas : FAA
Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

ON NOV/XA/99 AT ABOUT XA20, WE DEPARTED FROM SLIDELL, LA, ARPT (6R0) ON AN INST TRAINING FLT IN VFR CONDITIONS TO PREPARE THE PLT FOR A PART 135, AIR TAXI, CHK RIDE THE FOLLOWING DAY. I WAS ACTING AS SAFETY PLT/INSTRUCTOR AT THE TIME. CONDITIONS WERE SKY CLR, VISIBILITY APPROX 8 MI IN HAZE. SHORTLY AFTER DEP, THE PLT (WHO IS FILING A SEPARATE NASA RPT ON THIS SAME SIT) CLBED TO 3500 FT AND PROCEEDED TOWARD HAMMOND, LA, ARPT (0R9) WHERE WE INTENDED TO PERFORM MULTIPLE INST APCHS. IN THE CLB, THE PLT CONTACTED NEW ORLEANS APCH CTL AND ADVISED THE CTLR OF OUR INTENTIONS. WE WERE GIVEN A SQUAWK AND CLRED DIRECT HAMMOND VOR WITH INSTRUCTIONS TO REMAIN VFR. APPROX 1/2 WAY TO HAMMOND, I RESTR THE PLT'S OUTSIDE VISIBILITY (SIMULATED IFR) BY PLACING AN IFR ENRTE CHART ACROSS THE PLT'S SIDE OF THE FRONT WINDSCREEN. WE ARRIVED AT HAMMOND AND COMMENCED WITH OUR TRAINING APCHS. WE WERE IN CONTINUAL CONTACT WITH NEW ORLEANS APCH CTL ON FREQ 119.3 AND DUTIFULLY BROADCAST ON THE HAMMOND ADVISORY FREQ (122.9) AS DIRECTED BY APCH EACH TIME WE WERE NEARING THE CONCLUSION OF AN APCH MANEUVER. EACH TIME A MISSED APCH WAS EXECUTED AND WE RETURNED TO APCH FREQ, THE #2 COMS RADIO WAS PLACED ON THE ADVISORY FREQ AND ITS SELECTOR PLACED IN THE 'PHONE' POS SO THAT LCL TFC COULD BE MONITORED, AS WELL AS APCH. WE HAD BEEN IN THE LCL AREA FOR SOME TIME AND WERE CONCLUDING PERHAPS OUR 4TH OR 5TH APCH, WHICH IN THIS INSTANCE WAS AN ILS TO RWY 18, CONDUCTED WITH A SIMULATED FAILURE OF 1 ENG. AS HAD BEEN THE NORM, WHEN INSTRUCTED TO CHANGE TO ADVISORY FREQ, THE PLT DID SO AND ANNOUNCED THAT WE WERE INBOUND FOR THE ILS RWY 18 AT HAMMOND. NO RADIO TFC WAS HEARD AND NO TFC WAS IMMEDIATELY OBSERVED AS THE APCH COMMENCED AND CONTINUED. AT DECISION HT (244 FT) I INSTRUCTED THE PLT TO INITIATE A MISSED APCH. AS HE WAS INITIATING THE SINGLE ENG MISSED APCH, I OBSERVED AT APPROX OUR 10:30 - 11 O'CLOCK POS, A SINGLE ENG, HIGH WING ACFT, BELIEVED TO BE A CESSNA, APCHING FROM OUR L (E), PERPENDICULAR TO OUR COURSE, AND TRAVELING W. THE ACFT WAS ABOVE US AND AHEAD OF US, NEAR THE MIDPOINT OF THE ARPT AND RWY 18. A VERY ROUGH ESTIMATE OF ITS ALT IS 500-600 FT ABOVE US, OR 750-800 FT (THE PATTERN ALT IS 800 FT AGL). SENSING THE POTENTIAL CONFLICT. I ANNOUNCED TO THE PLT THAT I HAD CTL OF THE ACFT, TOOK CTL, IMMEDIATELY STOPPED OUR CLB FROM THE DECISION HT, MAINTAINED LEVEL FLT AT OR NEAR THE DECISION HT AND PASSED EITHER BELOW OR SLIGHTLY TO THE REAR AND UNDERNEATH THE CESSNA. WE DID NOT HAVE TO TAKE EXTRAORDINARY EVASIVE ACTION NOR DID THE CESSNA WHICH CONTINUED IN STRAIGHT AND LEVEL FLT. VERT SEPARATION WAS ESTIMATED AT APPROX 500-600 FT. NO BROADCAST WAS HEARD NOR WAS ONE MADE BY US CONCERNING THE INCIDENT. AFTER THE UNEVENTFUL PASSAGE, CTL WAS RETURNED TO THE PLT WHO COMPLETED THE SINGLE ENG MISSED APCH, CLBING TO THE ASSIGNED ALT OF 2000 FT AND MAINTAINING RWY HDG AS APCH HAD INSTRUCTED. THE CESSNA PROCEEDED OFF TO THE W AS WE CLBED OUT TO THE S. IT IS UNKNOWN WHETHER THE CESSNA ENTERED THE PATTERN AND LANDED. APPROX 15-20 MINS LATER, AS WE WERE HOLDING OVERHEAD THE ARPT ON THE HAMMOND VOR AT 2000 FT, AN ACFT CAME ONTO THE APCH FREQ INQUIRING IF APCH WAS IN CONTACT WITH A TWIN CESSNA MANEUVERING OVER HAMMOND ARPT. APCH, OF COURSE, REPLIED IN THE AFFIRMATIVE THAT WE HAD BEEN OPERATING VFR AND THAT WE WERE CURRENTLY HOLDING ON THE VOR AT 2000 FT. THE PLT THEN ASKED APCH FOR OUR REGISTRATION NUMBER AND APCH ASKED IF HE HAD A COMPLAINT OF SOME SORT. HIS RESPONSE WAS THAT WE '...WERE NOT LISTENING TO THE LCL FREQ AND HAD NEARLY CAUSED A MIDAIR.' WHEN THE PLT CONCLUDED HIS INQUIRY, I WENT ON APCH FREQ AND CLRLY STATED WHAT APCH ALREADY KNEW, THAT WE HAD BEEN MONITORING THE LCL FREQ CONTINUALLY, HAD BEEN IN CONTINUOUS CONTACT WITH APCH, THAT WE HAD HEARD NO XMISSIONS INDICATING TFC AND THAT WE WISHED TO MEET WITH THE COMPLAINING PLT. APCH REPLIED THAT HE HAD LEFT THE AREA AND WAS 6 MI TO THE N. IN RETROSPECT, HAVING IMMEDIATELY AND VERY CRITICALLY DEBRIEFED THE SIT WITH THE PLT FOR WHOM I WAS ACTING AS SAFETY PLT, WE BELIEVE, TO THE BEST OF OUR COLLECTIVE KNOWLEDGE, THAT HE DID NOT FAIL TO CONTACT AND MONITOR THE ADVISORY FREQ WHEN SO ADVISED. WE HAVE AGREED ON THE BELOW POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTING FACTORS: 1) USE OF CHART TO COVER L HALF OF WINDSCREEN OBSTRUCTED SAFETY PLT'S VISION TO L SIDE (THAT OF APCHING ACFT). 2) INTENSITY OF PHYSICAL AND MENTAL DEMANDS/WORKLOAD ASSOCIATED WITH THE SINGLE ENG MISSED APCH AT LOW ALT POTENTIALLY AFFECTED THE ABILITY TO DIVIDE ATTN BTWN SAFE CONDUCT OF THE FLT AND SCANNING FOR TFC. 3) COMS FAILURE(S) OR BREAKDOWNS (?) IF ANY, IN FACT, OCCURRED ON OUR PART, THEY WOULD UNDOUBTEDLY BE DUE TO #2. 4) POSSIBLE FAILURE OF THE OTHER PARTY TO MONITOR THE ADVISORY FREQ AND EFFECTIVELY COMMUNICATE. 5) FAILURE OF OTHER PARTY TO EFFECTIVELY SEE AND AVOID, AS WELL AS FAILURE TO YIELD TO OUR ACFT WHICH WAS BOTH 'LNDG' AND AT A LOWER ALT.

Synopsis :

C421 HAD LTSS FROM A CESSNA AT AN UNCTLED ARPT AT HDC.

Time

Date : 199911

Day : Mon

Local Time Of Day : 0601 To 1200

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : OLV.Airport

State Reference : MS

Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Make Model : Small Aircraft, Low Wing, 1 Eng, Retractable Gear

Person / 1

Function.Oversight : PIC

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 950

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 120

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 140

ASRS Report : 454345

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Events

Anomaly.Ground Encounters.Other : PROP STRIKE

Anomaly.Non Adherence : Published Procedure

Anomaly.Other Anomaly : Loss Of Aircraft Control

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1

Resolatory Action.None Taken : Unable

Consequence.Other : Maintenance Action

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

I WAS FLYING WITH A STUDENT (MULTI ENG). TOWARDS THE END OF THE LESSON, WE ENTERED THE OLV TFC PATTERN TO PRACTICE LNDGS. I INSTRUCTED MY STUDENT TO LAND ON THE 1000 FT MARKERS AND PREPARE FOR A TOUCH-AND-GO. AFTER THE LNDG, MY STUDENT RETRACTED THE FLAPS, ADDED FULL PWR AND BEGAN TO ROTATE. JUST AFTER LIFTOFF, MY STUDENT REACHED TO THE GEAR HANDLE AND BEGAN TO CYCLE THE LNDG GEAR. I YELLED 'NO' AND MOVED FOR HIS HAND. AS SOON AS I YELLED, HE LET GO OF THE CTLs AND THE LNDG GEAR HANDLE. AS THE PLANE SUNK TO THE GND, THE R MAIN GEAR BEGAN TO RETRACT. I ADDED BACK PRESSURE AND ATTEMPTED TO KEEP THE PLANE AIRBORNE. I WAS UNSUCCESSFUL. THE R PROP STRUCK THE GND AS WE SLID DOWN THE RWY. WE SLID TO THE R AFTER 100 FT OR SO BECAUSE THE L MAIN GEAR AND NOSE GEAR REMAINED EXTENDED AND LOCKED IN PLACE. WE SLID ON THE PROP AND FLAP HINGES INTO THE GRASS WHERE WE HIT A RWY LIGHT THAT DENTED THE LEADING EDGE AND BELLY OF THE R WING. WE CAME TO A COMPLETE STOP AND I SHUT EVERYTHING DOWN IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE EMER CHKLST. EVEN THOUGH I SAW MY STUDENT PULL THE GEAR HANDLE, I DID NOT PREVENT THE SIT. I SHOULD HAVE MAINTAINED A CONTINUOUS VOCAL CHKLST WITH MY STUDENT (MAKING HIM CALL OUT THE ACTION BEFORE HE PERFORMED THE ACTION). ALSO, I SHOULD HAVE MAINTAINED A PROPER OUT FOR THE SIT. I WILL NOW MAKE ALL STUDENTS OF A COMPLEX ACFT MAKE FULL STOP LNDGS.

Synopsis :

INSTRUCTOR PLT UNABLE TO RECOVER DURING TOUCH-AND-GO WHEN STUDENT QUILTS FLYING AFTER MAKING AN ERROR IN A COMPLEX ACFT.

Time

Date : 199911

Day : Sat

Local Time Of Day : 1201 To 1800

Place

State Reference : CA

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 3000

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Make Model : Small Aircraft, Low Wing, 2 Eng, Retractable Gear

Component / 1

Aircraft Component : Propeller Pitch Change Mechanism

Aircraft Reference : X

Problem : Failed

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 3300

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 150

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 200

ASRS Report : 454447

Person / 2

Function.Oversight : PIC

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Person / 3

Function.Controller : Approach

Events

Anomaly.Aircraft Equipment Problem : Critical

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewB : 2

Resolatory Action.Flight Crew : Landed In Emergency Condition

Resolatory Action.Controller : Issued New Clearance

Consequence.Other : Maintenance Action

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Aircraft

Narrative :

WHILE PRACTICING SINGLE ENG MANEUVERS NEAR CCR ARPT, THE R ENG WAS INTENTIONALLY SHUT DOWN TO SIMULATE AN ENG FAILURE. AFTER COMPLETING THE SHUTDOWN CHKLST, AN ENG RESTART WAS ATTEMPTED ON THE R ENG. THE R PROP WOULD NOT COME OUT OF FEATHER, DUE TO A POSSIBLE ACCUMULATOR FAILURE, WHICH NORMALLY ASSISTS THE PROP OUT OF FEATHER. AFTER SEVERAL ATTEMPTS TO BRING THE R PROP OUT OF FEATHER (ALL OF WHICH WERE SUCCESSFUL) IT WAS DECIDED BY THE CFI TO RETURN TO CONCORD ARPT AND LAND ON THE OPERATING L ENG. THE R ENG WAS SECURED AND SHUT DOWN. WE LANDED WITHOUT ANY FURTHER EVENT AND TAXIED BACK TO THE FBO WITH THE L ENG OPERATING NORMALLY.

Synopsis :

AN ATP CANDIDATE RPTED THAT, DURING THE COMPLETION OF A SIMULATED ENG OUT MANEUVER, THE R PROP WOULD NOT COME OUT OF FEATHER. HE AND HIS CFII MEI LANDED AT CCR, ON THE L ENG, WITHOUT INCIDENT.

Time

Date : 199911

Day : Sat

Local Time Of Day : 1201 To 1800

Place

State Reference : TX

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 1500

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Make Model : Cessna 150

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 4300

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 200

Person / 2

Function.Oversight : PIC

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot

Person / 3

Function.Other Personnel : FSS Specialist

Events

Anomaly.Other Spatial Deviation : Track Or Heading Deviation

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 2

Resolatory Action.Flight Crew : Became Reoriented

Resolatory Action.Other : FSS Specilist called ISTR

Consequence.FAA : Assigned Or Threatened Penalties

Consequence.FAA : Investigated

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

ON NOV/XA/99, A STUDENT PLT CAME TO ME FOR A SOLO XCOUNTRY ENDORSEMENT. THE FLT WAS TO BE CONDUCTED FROM EYQ-SGR-GLS AND RETURN. I REVIEWED HIS FLT PLANNING AND GAVE HIM THE ENDORSEMENT. ON THE RETURN FLT, THE STUDENT PLT GOT LOST. AFTER REALIZING THAT HE NEEDED HELP, MONTGOMERY COUNTY FSS WAS CONTACTED. RECEIVED ASSISTANCE AND LANDED SAFELY. AFTER THE FLT, IT WAS DISCOVERED ON THE RETURN FLT (GLS-SGR LEG) THE STUDENT HAD THE WRONG HDG ENTERED INTO HIS FLT LOG. THE STUDENT PLT WAS NOT MY STUDENT AND HAD FLOWN THIS RTE PRIOR, WHILE RECEIVING INSTRUCTION. DUE TO BEING A JUNIOR FLT INSTRUCTOR, I ALLOWED MYSELF TO MISPERCEIVE HIS ABILITIES, WHICH RESULTED IN NOT NOTICING THE ERROR IN PLANNING. I NOW REALIZE HOW CRITICAL IT IS TO TREAT EACH XCOUNTRY AS IT IS THE STUDENT'S FIRST, WHETHER SOLO OR DUAL. TO PREVENT FUTURE RECURRENCE, I HAVE SET A PERSONAL STANDARD OF NOT ENDORSING OTHER STUDENTS UNTIL I AM MUCH MORE EXPERIENCED. ALSO, I'M OBTAINING REMEDIAL TRAINING ON ENDORSEMENTS AND INSTRUCTOR'S RESPONSIBILITIES.

Synopsis :

C150 STUDENT PLT GOT LOST ON SOLO XCOUNTRY.

Time

Date : 199911

Day : Tue

Local Time Of Day : 1201 To 1800

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : AMA.Airport

State Reference : TX

Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 60

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.Tower : AMA.Tower

Make Model : Military Trainer

Aircraft / 2

Controlling Facilities.Tower : AMA.Tower

Make Model : Fighting Falcon F16

Aircraft / 3

Controlling Facilities.Tower : AMA.Tower

Make Model : Fighting Falcon F16

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Instructor

ASRS Report : 454695

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Person / 3

Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot

Person / 4

Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot

Person / 5

Function.Controller : Local

Events

Anomaly.Conflict : Airborne Critical

Anomaly.Non Adherence : Clearance

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1

Resolatory Action.Flight Crew : Took Precautionary Avoidance Action

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

I WAS FLYING ACI IN THE VFR PATTERN (R-HAND) ON RWY 22 AT AMA. I WAS CLRED THE OPTION AND SUBSEQUENTLY CALLED R BASE AND INITIATED THE TURN. AT THIS TIME, I HEARD THE TWR TALK TO AN ACFT AND TELL HIM TO BREAK OFF HIS APCH 1 NM PRIOR TO THE RWY. NOT HEARING A REPLY, I (WE) QUERIED THE CTLR IF HE MEANT THAT CALL FOR US. HE SAID NO, YOU ARE CLRED THE OPTION AND ADVISED US OF OPPOSITE DIRECTION F16 TFC THAT WOULD BREAK OFF THEIR APCH 1 MI PRIOR TO THE RWY THRESHOLD (RWY 4). WE CONTINUED THE PATTERN TO A TOUCH-AND-GO. WATCHING THE OPPOSITE DIRECTION TFC, WE CONTINUED THE TOUCH-AND-GO. AT ROTATION SPD, IT WAS EVIDENT THAT THEY (THE F16'S) WERE NOT FOLLOWING THEIR INSTRUCTIONS. BEING BEYOND A SAFE ABORT SPD, I TOLD THE TWR 'YOU BETTER BREAK THESE GUYS OFF.' I HAD TO ROTATE, BUT LEVELED MY ACFT OFF ABOUT 60 FT AGL UNTIL THE F16'S BROKE OFF THEIR APCH OVERHEAD MY POS. DURING SUBSEQUENT CONVERSATION WITH THE CTL TWR PERSONNEL, THEY SAID HE ACKNOWLEDGED HIS CLRNC TO BREAK OFF APCH PRIOR TO THRESHOLD (1 NM). THE APCH CTL SUPVR WAS SUBSEQUENTLY NOTIFIED OF MY INTENT TO FILE AN NMAC RPT. THIS SIT COULD HAVE BEEN AVOIDED IF THE F16 PLT FOLLOWED HIS CLRNC OR IF THE TWR CTLR CALLED THE F16 AND REQUIRED HIM TO TURN OFF AFTER HE DID NOT DO SO AT 1 MI PRIOR TO THE RWY. THE F16 WAS USING UHF, WHILE I WAS ON A VHF RADIO.

Synopsis :

A BEECH T-1A MIL INSTRUCTOR PLT HAD 2 F16 ACFT PASS 500 FT OVERHEAD ON TKOF FROM AMA.

Time

Date : 199911
Day : Mon
Local Time Of Day : 1201 To 1800

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : IWA.Airport
State Reference : AZ
Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 3500

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.Tower : IWA.Tower
Make Model : Golden Eagle 421

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Instructor
Experience.Flight Time.Total : 900
Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 200
Experience.Flight Time.Type : 30
ASRS Report : 454800

Person / 2

Function.Oversight : PIC
Function.Instruction : Trainee
Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot
Experience.Flight Time.Total : 5000
Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 40
Experience.Flight Time.Type : 1200
ASRS Report : 454805

Person / 3

Function.Controller : Local

Events

Anomaly.Other Spatial Deviation : Track Or Heading Deviation
Anomaly.Airspace Violation : Entry
Anomaly.Non Adherence : FAR
Anomaly.Non Adherence : Published Procedure
Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1
Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewB : 2
Resolatory Action.Flight Crew : Exited Penetrated Airspace
Resolatory Action.None Taken : Detected After The Fact

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Airspace Structure
Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

BEFORE DEP FROM THE CHANDLER ARPT, I DECIDED WE SHOULD USE THE SID PROC IN ORDER TO GIVE US TIME TO CLB ABOVE THE PHX CLASS B AIRSPACE. THE DEP PROC IS BASICALLY DIRECT S TO THE STANFIELD VOR. ALTHOUGH WE WERE HEADED N, I FELT THAT A COUPLE OF EXTRA MINS WAS WORTH AVOIDING THE CLASS B AIRSPACE. UPON ARR AT THE ACFT I DISCUSSED THIS PLAN WITH THE OTHER PLT WHO INFORMED ME THAT IT WOULD BE BETTER TO DEPART TO THE N UNDER THE CLASS B AIRSPACE. I BELIEVE HIS REASONING WAS THAT IT WOULD SAVE TIME AND FUEL -- 2 THINGS WE WOULD BE SHORT ON DURING THIS LONG TRIP WITH SOME STIFF HEADWINDS. BY THIS TIME I WAS ALREADY IN THE ACFT AND HAD TO ORGANIZE A RTE QUICKLY SO WE COULD GET MOVING. LOOKING AT THE CHARTS, A TURN DIRECT TO THE WILLIAMS/GATEWAY VOR WOULD KEEP US CLR OF THE CLASS B AIRSPACE. ONCE WE WERE NEAR THE VOR, A TURN TO THE N WOULD ALLOW US SAFE PASSAGE TO THE N AROUND FALCON FIELD AND SCOTTSDALE. UNFORTUNATELY, IN MY HASTE TO KEEP US CLR OF THE CLASS B AIRSPACE, I NEGLECTED THE FACT THAT WILLIAMS CLASS D AIRSPACE OVERLAPS CHANDLER AND EVEN THAT WILLIAMS WAS CLASS D. AFTER DEP FROM THE RIGHT SWBOUND RWY WE WERE CLRED FOR AN IMMEDIATE L TURN AND FREQ CHANGE. THE FACT THAT WE WERE GIVEN THE FREQ CHANGE SO SOON AFTER DEP CAUSED AN ALARM TO GO OFF IN MY HEAD. I TOLD THE OTHER PLT TO LEVEL OFF AT 3500 FT MSL AND I CHKED MY CHARTS. BY THE TIME I REALIZED WHAT HAD OCCURRED WE WERE INSIDE THE W CORNER OF WILLIAMS AIRSPACE. I GAVE THE PLT AN IMMEDIATE TURN TO THE N AND I SWITCHED OVER TO WILLIAMS TWR. I ESTIMATE WE INCURRED THE AIRSPACE BY ABOUT 1/4 - 1/2 NM BASED ON THE GPS GND TRACK DISPLAY. IT SEEMED AS THOUGH WE WERE IN THE AIRSPACE AS QUICKLY AS WE WERE OUT OF IT. ONCE I WAS SURE WE WERE CLR, I GAVE THE OTHER PLT A TURNOUT E OF FALCON FIELD TO GATHER MY THOUGHTS. AFTER 1 MIN, I PICKED UP A CANAL THAT HEADED TOWARDS SCOTTSDALE AND WE TURNED DIRECT TO IT. I CONTACTED SCOTTSDALE TWR AND WE WERE CLRED TO PASS DIRECTLY OVER THE ARPT NBOUND. THE HUMAN FACTORS I HAVE IDENTED INCLUDE A LACK OF EXPERIENCE IN THIS ACFT, A LACK OF PLANNING ON MY PART, A LACK OF COM BTWN MYSELF AND THE OTHER PLT, AND THE PRESSURE OF TIME. FROM THIS EXPERIENCE I HAVE LEARNED THAT IT IS IMPORTANT TO TAKE SOME TIME IN PLANNING AND NEVER LET ANYTHING PRESSURE ME INTO HURRYING.

Synopsis :

C421 PLTS INCURRED IWA CLASS D AIRSPACE ON DEP IN THE PHX AREA.

Time

Date : 199911

Day : Tue

Local Time Of Day : 1201 To 1800

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : TX04.Airport

Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 300

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Make Model : Cessna 152

Component / 1

Aircraft Component : Aeroplane Flight Control

Aircraft Reference : X

Problem : Improperly Operated

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 52.6

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 11.5

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 27.6

ASRS Report : 454810

Person / 2

Function.Controller : Non Radar

Person / 4

Function.Observation : Air Carrier Inspector

Events

Anomaly.Non Adherence : Clearance

Anomaly.Non Adherence : Company Policies

Anomaly.Other Anomaly : Unstabilized Approach

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1

Resolatory Action.Flight Crew : Landed As Precaution

Consequence.FAA : Reviewed Incident With Flight Crew

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Aircraft

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

WHILE DOING TKOFS AND LNDG PRACTICE ON RWY 17L AT DWH, WINDS 150 DEGS AT 10 KTS. FIRST LNDG WAS OK, SECOND LNDG REQUIRED A GAR. THE AIRPLANE KEPT YAWING TO THE R MAKING THE LNDG UNSAFE. ON TKOF AND BEST RATE OF CLB (67 KTS) THE PLANE MAINTAINED ITS YAW TO THE R EVEN WITH FULL L RUDDER DEFLECTION. IN ORDER TO AVOID STALLING THE PLANE AT LOW ALT BY ATTEMPTING TO MAKE A TURN BACK TO THE ARPT, I DECIDED TO LAND THE PLANE ON A PATTERN DIRT FIELD ON THE SW END OF RWY 17R. I WAS ABLE TO LAND THE PLANE SAFELY WITHOUT INJURY TO MYSELF, DAMAGE TO THE ACFT OR PVT PROPERTY. THE ACFT WAS LATER INSPECTED BY THE SCHOOL'S A&P MECH AND AN FAA INSPECTOR AND NOTHING WAS FOUND WRONG WITH THE RUDDER CTLS. THE ONLY LOGICAL CONCLUSION WOULD BE THAT IT WAS PLT ERROR, BUT TO THE BEST OF MY RECOLLECTION THE ACFT RUDDER CTLS MALFUNCTIONED. WHEN I RESUME MY TRAINING TOWARDS MY PVT PLT CERTIFICATE, I WILL REVIEW TRAINING IN THE AREAS OF XWIND LNDGS AND EFFECTS OF PRIMARY FLT CTLS, AERONAUTICAL DECISION MAKING AND SPATIAL DISORIENTATION.

Synopsis :

PLT TRAINEE LANDS INTENTIONALLY IN DIRT OFF RWY THINKING SOMETHING IS WRONG WITH THE ACFT (C152) RUDDER AT DWH.

Time

Date : 199911

Day : Mon

Local Time Of Day : 1201 To 1800

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : POC.Airport

State Reference : CA

Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.Tower : POC.Tower

Make Model : PA-34-200 Seneca I

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 321

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 40

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 3

ASRS Report : 455166

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Events

Anomaly.Other Anomaly : Loss Of Aircraft Control

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewB : 2

Resolatory Action.None Taken : Insufficient Time

Consequence.Other : Maintenance Action

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Aircraft

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

THE CHAIN OF EVENTS THAT LED TO THE SIT THAT OCCURRED ON NOV/XA/99 ARE AS FOLLOWS. I WAS RECEIVING MULTI-ENG INSTRUCTOR FLT INSTRUCTION. THIS FLT WAS MY THIRD FLT IN THE MAKE AND MODEL OF ACFT. THIS SPECIFIC MODEL WAS NOT EQUIPPED WITH BRAKES ON THE R SIDE OF THE ACFT. PRIOR TO ENTERING THE TFC PATTERN, I DISCUSSED SPDS, PWR SETTING AND DIRECTIONAL CTL BEING THE INSTRUCTOR'S RESPONSIBILITY ON THE GND. SEVERAL FULL STOP TAXI-BACKS WERE CONDUCTED AND POSITIVE DIRECTIONAL CTL RESPONSIBILITY WAS USED, EG, 'YOU HAVE THE CTLS,' 'I HAVE THE CTLS,' 'YOU HAVE THE CTLS.' UPON MAKING OUR LAST LNDG, THE TWR CLRED US TO EXIT THE RWY AND CONTACT GND CTL. THE APCH WAS NORMAL. AS MY INSTRUCTOR ASSUMED DIRECTIONAL CTL HER FOOT BECAME STUCK. THE ACFT'S TRACK WAS SLIGHTLY R OF CTRLINE AND IT WAS CLR THAT HER FOOT WAS 'STUCK' IN SUCH A WAY TO CAUSE THE BRAKE TO LOCK AND A SKID OCCURRED. SHE COMPLAINED OVER AND OVER OF HER FOOT BEING STUCK. I TRIED TO USE THE RUDDER PEDALS TO CORRECT BUT HER FOOT WAS STUCK IN SUCH A MANNER THAT I COULD NOT CORRECT THE ACFT'S DIRECTION. WHEN IT BECAME APPARENT THAT THE ACFT WAS GOING TO DEPART THE RWY, I MADE THE DECISION TO SHUT THE ENGS DOWN TO AVOID ANY POSSIBLE DAMAGE THAT COULD POSSIBLY OCCUR. THE THROTTLES WERE AT AN IDLE POS. I CLOSED THE MIXTURES, AND PLACED THE PROP CTLS IN THE FEATHER DETENT. I INCREASED BACK PRESSURE TO INCREASE TAIL DOWN FORCE AND AVOID COLLAPSING THE NOSEWHEEL. THE ACFT DEPARTED THE RWY SLIGHTLY R OF CTRLINE AT A SPD EQUIVALENT TO A BRISK WALK. AS MY INSTRUCTOR WORKED TO FREE HER FOOT, I PLACED THE FUEL SELECTORS IN THE OFF POS AND TURNED OFF ALL ELECTRICAL EQUIP. WE GOT OUT OF THE ACFT UNHURT AND RECEIVED A RIDE FROM THE ARPT AUTH TO THE HANGAR. AFTER THE MAINT TECHNICIANS INSPECTED THE ACFT IT WAS TAXIED BACK TO THE HANGAR UNDER ITS OWN PWR. THE ACFT WAS INSPECTED AND RETURNED TO SVC THE FOLLOWING DAY. THE CONTRIBUTING FACTOR WAS THE APPAREL WORN BY THE INSTRUCTOR THAT CAUSED HER FOOT TO BECOME STUCK. UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS TAKEN TO SHUT THE ENGS DOWN TO AVOID PWRPLANT DAMAGE AND INCREASING BACK PRESSURE TO AVOID LNDG GEAR FAILURE PROVED TO BE EFFECTIVE. COSTLY ACFT DAMAGE WAS AVOIDED. I NEVER CONSIDERED THAT CLOTHING AND APPAREL COULD BE SUCH A FACTOR IN THE CTL OR LOSS OF CTL OF AN ACFT. THE COMS MADE BTWN THE INSTRUCTOR AND MYSELF WERE CLR. THE USE OF EMER PROCS WAS COMPLETED. AFTER REVIEWING THE SIT OVER AND OVER IN MY HEAD AND DISCUSSING IT WITH ANOTHER INSTRUCTOR, I AM AWARE THAT MY ACTIONS PROBABLY SAVED THE PWRPLANT AND LNDG GEAR OF THE ACFT. IN THE FUTURE, I WILL PAY SPECIFIC ATTN TO CLOTHING AND APPAREL AND THEIR EFFECTS ON CTL INPUT. AS PART OF THE PREFLT BRIEFING, UNDER 'FLT CTLS FREE AND CORRECT,' I HAVE STARTED MAKING SURE THAT MY APPAREL DOES NOT INHIBIT MY ABILITY TO MAKE CTL INPUTS. I ALSO AM NOT LIKELY TO CONDUCT FLT TRAINING OR RECEIVE FLT TRAINING IN AN ACFT THAT DOES NOT HAVE DUAL BRAKING SYS.

Synopsis :

PA34-200 LEAVES RWY WHEN INSTRUCTOR'S FOOT BECOMES STUCK IN THE RUDDER CTLS.

Time

Date : 199911

Day : Sat

Local Time Of Day : 1201 To 1800

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : 2OH9.Airport

State Reference : OH

Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Make Model : Any Unknown or Unlisted Aircraft Manufacturer

Component / 1

Aircraft Component : Speedbrake/Spoiler

Aircraft Reference : X

Problem : Failed

Problem : Improperly Operated

Person / 1

Function.Oversight : PIC

Function.Instruction : Instructor

ASRS Report : 455362

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Events

Anomaly.Ground Encounters.Other : Railroad Tie

Anomaly.Conflict : Ground Critical

Anomaly.Non Adherence : Published Procedure

Anomaly.Other Anomaly : Loss Of Aircraft Control

Anomaly.Other Anomaly : Speed Deviation

Anomaly.Other Anomaly : Unstabilized Approach

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewB : 2

Resolatory Action.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action

Consequence.Other : Aircraft Damaged

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Aircraft

Problem Areas : Environmental Factor

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

NOV/XA/99 AT XA30, I WAS CONDUCTING A LCL VFR TRAINING FLT IN A SCHWEIZER SGS 2-33 GLIDER, BASED AT WAYNESVILLE ARPT, OH. THE WX WAS CLR SKIES AND UNRESTR CEILING, WITH LIGHT AND VARIABLE WINDS FAVORING THE S. MY STUDENT HAD 19 FLTS AMOUNTING TO 6 HRS OF TRAINING WITH ME. THE STUDENT FLEW A NICE AERO TOW AND DEMONSTRATED PROFICIENCY IN THE BASIC TRAINING MANEUVERS ON AND OFF TOW, AFTER WHICH WE ENTERED A NORMAL PATTERN FOR LNDG. TURNING FINAL WE WERE HIGH AND FAST. I LET THE STUDENT CONTINUE AND SHE BEGAN CORRECTING APPROPRIATELY WITH SPOILERS FOR OUR GLIDE PATH. THOUGH SHE MAINTAINED HER EXTRA SPD, WE WERE ON TARGET FOR OUR AIM POINT AS WE ENTERED GND EFFECT. AT THIS POINT SHE BEGAN FULL DISPLACEMENT AND RETRACTION OF THE SPOILERS, PERHAPS IN AN ATTEMPT TO MAKE A 'SMOOTH' LNDG. I TRIED TO COACH HER TO THE PROPER TECHNIQUE, BUT ONLY WASTED VALUABLE RWY. I TOOK CTL TOO LATE FOR NORMAL STOPPING TECHNIQUES, AND IN AN ATTEMPT TO STOP WE HAD TO AVOID A PARKED ACFT AND EVENTUALLY STRUCK A RAILROAD TIE WITH THE R WINGTIP DOING SUBSTANTIAL DAMAGE. THE SPOILER HANDLE IN THIS GLIDER EMPLOYS A WHEEL BRAKE ON THE LAST FEW INCHES OF TRAVEL. WHEN I FIRST APPLIED FULL BRAKING, THE HANDLE CAME OFF IN MY HAND. THEN ON REAPPLICATION, THE WHEEL LOCKED UP AND WE SLID ON THE WET GRASS TO IMPACT. I BELIEVE IT WAS POOR JUDGEMENT ON MY PART TO WAIT SO LATE IN THE LNDG TO TAKE CTL.

Synopsis :

A GLIDER INSTRUCTOR IN AN SGS 2-33 RPTD THAT HE DID NOT TAKE THE CTLS EARLY ENOUGH FROM HIS STUDENT DURING A LNDG ATTEMPT, CAUSING THEM TO LAND LONG. THEY HIT A RAILROAD TIE, CAUSING EXTENSIVE DAMAGE TO THE WINGTIP.

Time

Date : 199911

Day : Sun

Local Time Of Day : 0601 To 1200

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : NZY.Airport

State Reference : AB

Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.Tower : NZY.Tower

Make Model : Cessna 152

Person / 1

Function.Oversight : PIC

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 800

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 160

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 380

ASRS Report : 455390

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Person / 3

Function.Controller : Ground

Events

Anomaly.Non Adherence : Published Procedure

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1

Resolutive Action.None Taken : Detected After The Fact

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

MY STUDENT, WHEN TRYING TO CALL NZY GND TO TAXI FOR RUNUP, WAS ON SDM TWR FREQ. SDM TWR CLRED US FOR TAXI TO RUNUP. THEY SHOULD HAVE RECOGNIZED THE BAD CALL. SO SHOULD I. WE TAXIED TO OUR RUNUP WITHOUT ANY PROBS AND THAT IS WHERE I NOTICED THE ERROR.

Synopsis :

A CFI RPTED THAT HIS STUDENT INADVERTENTLY CALLED THE SDM TWR FOR TAXI INSTRUCTIONS INSTEAD OF THE NZY TWR ON WHICH ARPT THEY WERE LOCATED.

Time

Date : 199911

Day : Mon

Local Time Of Day : 1801 To 2400

Place

State Reference : IL

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 2500

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.ARTCC : ZAU.ARTCC

Controlling Facilities.TRACON : MKE.TRACON

Make Model : Skyhawk 172/Cutlass 172

Person / 1

Function.Oversight : PIC

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 1700

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 200

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 30

ASRS Report : 455411

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 70

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 20

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 70

ASRS Report : 455410

Person / 3

Function.Controller : Radar

Person / 4

Function.Controller : Approach

Events

Anomaly.Airspace Violation : Entry

Anomaly.Non Adherence : FAR

Independent Detector.Other.ControllerA : 3

Resolatory Action.None Taken : Detected After The Fact

Consequence.FAA : Investigated

Consequence.FAA : Reviewed Incident With Flight Crew

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Airspace Structure

Problem Areas : ATC Facility

Problem Areas : Chart Or Publication

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

TRAINING FLT ALONG CHICAGO'S AIRSPACE FROM UES TO GYY. RECEIVED WX INFO FOR FLT BUT DID NOT RECEIVE NOTICE OF TEMPORARY FLT RESTR. WX BRIEFING SHOULD HAVE BEEN OBTAINED BY PLTS. ALSO, I FEEL WAUKEGAN AND MEIGS TWR SHOULD HAVE MADE THE INFO AVAILABLE TO PLTS ENRTE. CALLBACK CONVERSATION WITH RPTR REVEALED THE FOLLOWING INFO: THE INSTRUCTOR SAID THE PURPOSE OF THE FLT WAS TO GIVE STUDENT FAMILIARITY WITH THE PROCS REQUIRED TO AVOID THE CHICAGO CLASS B AIRSPACE ALONG THE SHORE OF LAKE MICHIGAN. IN THE COURSE OF PREFLT AND FLT PLAN FILING, NOTAMS WERE CHKED BY COMPUTER, BUT NOT WITH DIRECT CONTACT WITH AN FSS BRIEFER. INTRUSION INTO THE RESTR AIRSPACE WAS DISCOVERED BY ZAU AND THE CREW WAS NOTIFIED BY MILWAUKEE APCH SINCE THAT WAS THE FREQ THEY WERE MONITORING ON THEIR VFR FLT. A REQUEST FOR A LETTER OF EXPLANATION WAS MADE BY FSDO. RPTR SAID THEY DID NOT CONTACT C90 SINCE THEY WERE BELOW C90 AIRSPACE AND DID NOT WISH TO INTERFERE WITH RADIO TFC WHICH IS TYPICALLY BUSY BECAUSE OF ORD TFC. IN HINDSIGHT, HE SUGGESTS THAT C90 WOULD HAVE BEEN THE ONES TO ADVISE THE CREW OF THE EXISTENCE OF THE TEMPORARY FLT RESTR.

Synopsis :

FLT TO PROVIDE INSTRUCTION ON HOW TO NAV C90 AREA LEADS TO ENTRY INTO TEMPORARY FLT RESTR AIRSPACE NEAR OBK UNKNOWN TO INSTRUCTOR.

Time

Date : 199911

Day : Tue

Local Time Of Day : 1201 To 1800

Place

State Reference : AZ

Altitude.MSL.Bound Lower : 4000

Altitude.MSL.Bound Upper : 6500

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.TRACON : U90.TRACON

Make Model : Thunderbolt II (Warthog A-10)

Aircraft / 2

Controlling Facilities.TRACON : U90.TRACON

Make Model : Thunderbolt II (Warthog A-10)

Aircraft / 3

Controlling Facilities.TRACON : U90.TRACON

Component / 1

Aircraft Component : Transponder

Aircraft Reference : Y

Problem : Improperly Operated

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 3350

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 45

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 1750

ASRS Report : 455592

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 2

Person / 3

Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot

Person / 4

Function.Controller : Departure

Events

Anomaly.Other Spatial Deviation : Track Or Heading Deviation

Anomaly.Non Adherence : Clearance

Independent Detector.ATC Equipment.Other ATC Equipment : Radar Mode C

Independent Detector.Other.ControllerA : 4

Resolatory Action.Controller : Issued Advisory

Resolatory Action.Controller : Issued New Clearance

Resolatory Action.Controller : Separated Traffic

Consequence.FAA : Reviewed Incident With Flight Crew

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

MISSION WAS A 2 SHIP A10 TRANSITION RIDE SCHEDULED TO THE TOMBSTONE MOA. THE UPGRADE PLT WAS LEADING THE SORTIE AND IT WAS HIS SECOND FLT IN THE A10, TOTAL TIME IN TYPE 2.4 HRS. THE INSTRUCTOR PLT WAS IN A CHASE POS DURING INITIAL TKOF/CLBOUT. THE UPGRADE PLT WAS SOMEWHAT FAMILIAR WITH THE DEP, HAVING FLOWN IT THE DAY PRIOR DURING HIS FIRST-EVER A10 SORTIE. ON INITIAL CONTACT WITH TUS DEP, HE RPTED PASSING 3800 FT AND DEP CTL ASKED HIM TO CHK SQUAWK (HE HAD FAILED TO TURN IT ON). THE IFR DEP CLRNC FOR THE FLT WAS 'RWY HDG, MAINTAIN 13000 FT, EXPECT 17000 FT 10 MINS AFTER DEP, DEP FREQ WAS LCL CHANNEL 4 SQUAWK XXXX. WHILE THE UPGRADE PLT RESET HIS SQUAWK AND IDENTED, THE INSTRUCTOR PLT WAS PROVIDING INFLT INSTRUCTION TO THE UPGRADE ON THE FM (INTERFLT) RADIO AND THIS COM STEPPED ON TUS DEP'S NEXT RADIO CALL TO THE FLT. THE UPGRADE PLT INITIATED A R TURN TO PROCEED TO 'REDDY' -- A FIX ON THE DEP -- AND CONTINUED TO CLB. BECAUSE THE INSTRUCTOR HAD STEPPED ON THE LAST XMISSION FROM DEP, HE WAS UNSURE OF THE VECTOR HDG PROVIDED TO FLT (IF ANY). BEFORE A TURN COULD BE MADE BACK TO RWY HDG, DEP CTL ASKED WHERE THE FLT WAS HEADING AND THAT THEY HAD NOT ISSUED A VECTOR, BUT NOW DIRECTED THE FLT TO TURN R, HDG 090 DEGS AND MAINTAIN ALT FOR CESSNA TFC (IFR) LOCATED NE AT 9500 FT. BOTH UPGRADE PLT AND INSTRUCTOR HAD VISUAL CONTACT WITH THE CESSNA AND WERE 3000 FT BELOW AND 2-3 NM Laterally AWAY FROM IT AT THE CLOSEST POINT. THE AVOIDANCE VECTOR WAS ONLY ISSUED FOR APPROX 20 SECONDS BEFORE ANOTHER VECTOR TO RESUME THE DEP WAS ISSUED AS THE TFC WAS NOW 'NO FACTOR.' WITHIN 2 MINS FLT WAS NOTIFIED OF A POSSIBLE DEV AND PROVIDED A LANDLINE NUMBER TO CONTACT TUS TRACON AFTER LNDG. HUMAN PERFORMANCE CONSIDERATION: LOW EXPERIENCE OF A10 UPGRADE PLT. UPGRADE PLT MISUNDERSTANDING OF IFR DEP PROCS/REQUIREMENTS. STUDENT TRAINING IN PROGRESS THROUGHOUT THIS SIT. INSTRUCTOR PLT INFLT INSTRUCTION ON FM RADIO STEPPED ON COM FROM TUS DEP CTL. UPGRADE PLT'S FAILURE TO TURN ON HIS XPONDER PRIOR TO TKOF CONTRIBUTED TO INITIAL CONFUSION. DEP DEPICTION IN LOCALLY DISTRIBUTED A10 FLT PUBS (INFLT GUIDE TO LCL AREA OPS), SHOWS A R TURNOUT ON DEP. THIS WAS CONFUSING ACCORDING TO THE UPGRADE PLT AND IS BEING INVESTIGATED THROUGH MIL CHANNELS. AFTER LNDG, UPGRADE PLT WAS PROVIDED WITH ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTION TO AVOID A REPEAT PERFORMANCE.

Synopsis :

A MIL INSTRUCTOR PLT RPT OF A POTENTIAL CONFLICT THAT DEP CTLR CORRECTED AFTER A FORMATION FLT OF 2 A10 ACFT HAD EXPERIENCED A HDG TRACK DEV ON DEP FROM TUS, AZ.

Time

Date : 199911

Day : Thu

Local Time Of Day : 1801 To 2400

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : TX05.Airport

State Reference : TX

Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Make Model : Cessna 152

Component / 1

Aircraft Component : Fuel

Aircraft Reference : X

Problem : Improperly Operated

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 1110

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 40

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 600

ASRS Report : 455652

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Events

Anomaly.Aircraft Equipment Problem : Critical

Anomaly.Non Adherence : FAR

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1

Resolatory Action.Flight Crew : Landed In Emergency Condition

Resolatory Action.Other : Off Airport Landing

Consequence.FAA : Investigated

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Aircraft

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

THE FIRST THING I DID WHEN ME AND MY STUDENT LANDED WAS FUEL THE AIRPLANE AND WENT UP TO DO SOME TOUCH-AND-GOES -- ABOUT 4. WE LANDED AT THE SAME ARPT AND WE REFUELED THE AIRPLANE AGAIN, AND LEFT THE ARPT DIRECT TO ADS. THE WINDS ALOFT WERE: 3000 FT, 180 DEGS AT 19 KTS GUSTING TO 29 KTS, 6000 FT, 190 DEGS 15 KTS GUSTING TO 25 KTS, AND 9000 FT, 180 DEGS 10 KTS. SO I DID THE FLT PLAN TO GO TO ADS AT 8500 FT ALT. THE FIRST CHK POINT WAS SMITH AND IT TOOK ME 25 MINS TO CLB TO 8500 FT AND REACH MY FIRST CHK POINT AT THE SAME TIME, WHICH WAS 25 NM, GS 55, FUEL 2.8. THE NEXT CHK POINT WAS ROBERT S KERR. IT TOOK FOR ME 41 NM, AND TIME 25 MINS, GS 72, FUEL 2.5. THE THIRD CHK POINT WAS MCCALLISTER. IT TOOK FOR ME 46 NM, 35 MINS, AND GS 72, FUEL 3.5. THE FOURTH CHK POINT WAS THE HWY. IT TOOK ME 23 NM, 15 MINS, GS 72, FUEL 1.5. THE FIFTH CHK WAS DURANT. IT TOOK ME 36 NM, 28 MINS, GS 72, AND FUEL 2.8. THE NEXT ONE WAS SHERMAN. IT TOOK ME 21 NM, 15 MINS, GS 72, FUEL 1.5. THE NEXT CHK POINT WAS MCKENNY. IT TOOK ME 30 NM, 21 MINS, GS 72, AND FUEL 2.1. THE LAST CHK POINT WAS THE DEST -- 18 NM, 12 MINS, GS 72, FUEL 1.2. THAT WAS MY FLT PLAN. WHAT HAPPENED IS THAT BTWN SHERMAN AND MCKENNY, 10 MINS PAST SHERMAN, HOBBS READING 2.2. I HAD ROUGHNESS IN THE ENG AND I STARTED TO LOSE A LOT OF RPM. I FOLLOWED MY CHKLIST TO MAKE SURE THAT EVERYTHING WAS WORKING PROPERLY BTWN THE MIXTURE AND FUEL SELECTOR. I STARTED TO JACK WITH THE THROTTLE AND I KEPT GLIDING AND HOLDING MY BEST GLIDE SPD, AND I DECIDED TO DIVERT TO MCKENNY BECAUSE I GOT NO CHOICE, ESPECIALLY SINCE I WAS IN THE MIDDLE OF SHERMAN AND MCKENNY. SO I MADE IT UP TO 1/4 MI FROM THE TOUCHDOWN. I AM SAFE AND MY STUDENT IS SAFE, TOO. ABOUT MY CALCULATION, I'M SUPPOSED TO FLY FROM VBT BENTON VELL, AR, TO ADS, TX, 2 HRS AND 50 MINS WITH 180 DEGS 10 KT WINDS AT 8500 FT, AT THE SAME TIME KEEPING RESERVE FUEL.

Synopsis :

A C152 CFI RPT ON AN OFF ARPT EMER NIGHT OP LNDG NEAR TX05, TX.

Time

Date : 199911

Day : Sat

Local Time Of Day : 0601 To 1200

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : VNY.Airport

State Reference : CA

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 2000

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.Tower : VNY.Tower

Make Model : Skyhawk 172/Cutlass 172

Aircraft / 2

Controlling Facilities.Tower : VNY.Tower

Make Model : Skyhawk 172/Cutlass 172

Aircraft / 3

Controlling Facilities.Tower : VNY.Tower

Make Model : Any Unknown or Unlisted Aircraft Manufacturer

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 51

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 51

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 51

ASRS Report : 455266

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Person / 3

Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot

Person / 4

Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot

Person / 5

Function.Controller : Local

Events

Anomaly.Other Spatial Deviation : Track Or Heading Deviation

Anomaly.Conflict : NMAC

Anomaly.Non Adherence : FAR

Anomaly.Non Adherence : Required Legal Separation

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewB : 2

Resolatory Action.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action

Consequence.FAA : Reviewed Incident With Flight Crew

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Airspace Structure

Problem Areas : ATC Human Performance

Problem Areas : Environmental Factor

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

APCHING THE SANTA SUSANA PASS, I RECEIVED ATIS INFO FOR THE ARPT, AND THEN PROCEEDED TO CONTACT VNY TWR. I DID NOT MAKE AN INITIAL XMISSION UNTIL THERE WAS A BREAK IN THE ABNORMALLY HVY ACTIVITY. AT THE POINT I WAS ABLE TO COMMUNICATE I WAS 11.9 NM FROM THE ARPT. THE CTLR WAS VERY BUSY, AND GAVE ME MY XPONDER SQUAWK CODE AT THE END OF ANOTHER XMISSION TO CLR AN ACFT FOR LNDG ON RWY 16R. AS TO HUMAN FACTORS, AT THIS POINT, I TURNED TO MY INSTRUCTOR AND SUGGESTED WE CALL IN AND MAKE SURE THE SQUAWK WAS FOR US. HE SAID HE HAD HEARD THE CALL AS WELL, ANNUNCIATED THE SQUAWK TO ME, AND THAT WE SHOULD JUST PROCEED. 'TECHNICALLY' WE HAD ESTABLISHED THE REQUIRED DIALOG NECESSARY FOR ENTERING THE CLASS D AIRSPACE WHICH WE WOULD BE IN SHORTLY. I EXECUTED A NORMAL DSCNT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING THE SANTA SUSANA PASS RPTING POINT, GOING FIRST FROM 3500 FT TO 2500 FT TO GET BELOW THE CLASS C FLOOR. I REACHED 2500 FT ABOUT 1/2 NM FROM 'THE COLLEGE' WHICH IS A RECOGNIZED RPTING POINT. I HAD NOT HEARD FROM THE CTLR AGAIN, THOUGH I DID HEAR A LOT OF TFC ON THE RADIOS. UPON REACHING THE COLLEGE, I QUICKLY RPTED OUR POS AND OUR ALT. AT THIS POINT, I RECEIVED A CLR RECOGNITION OF MY CALL. I WAS TOLD I WAS #3 FOR RWY 16R, AND I NEEDED TO MAKE MY BEST POSSIBLE SPD 'ALL THE WAY TO THE RWY.' (SEE ILLUSTRATION #1.) AT THE TIME, I THOUGHT THIS WAS AN ODD CALL -- WE ARE LESS THAN 4 NM OUT ON AN EXTENDED BASE (R TFC), THERE ARE 2 PLANES AHEAD OF US, AND THEY ASKED US TO GO AS FAST AS POSSIBLE. PERHAPS MOST SIGNIFICANTLY, WE DID NOT HAVE EITHER TFC IN SIGHT. IN MY CALL BACK, I CONFIRMED BEST POSSIBLE SPD AND ANNOUNCED THAT I WAS 'LOOKING FOR TFC.' I DISCUSSED WHAT 'BEST POSSIBLE SPD' WOULD BE WITH MY INSTRUCTOR, AND TOLD HIM MY CONCERN THAT WE WERE REALLY CLOSE AND IF WE KEPT 120 KTS THAT WE COULD NOT LOWER EVEN 1 NOTCH OF FLAPS. HE JUST SAID TO GO WITH IT, AND WE WOULD ASK TO SLOW DOWN ON FINAL. FOR THE RECORD, I DON'T THINK THIS WOULD HAVE WORKED ANYWAY, AS A NO-FLAP LNDG TAKES A LOT MORE MANEUVERING SPACE THAN WE WERE GOING TO HAVE. ALL OF A SUDDEN, WE SPOTTED TFC #1 AHEAD OF US, WHO WAS ON A STRAIGHT-IN FINAL TO RWY 16R. (SEE ILLUSTRATION #2.) WE WOULD HAVE SUFFICIENT SPACING AFTER THEM, HOWEVER, THAT LEFT THE QUESTION OF WHERE THE OTHER TFC WAS. AS IT WAS ALMOST TIME TO TURN FINAL, I CALLED IN TO RPT THAT WE STILL DID NOT HAVE THE OTHER TFC IN SIGHT. AS I LOOKED TO MY L PRIOR TO THE TURN, I STOPPED IN MID SENTENCE ON THE RADIO AS I SAW A C172 ON FINAL. MY INSTRUCTOR HEARD MY WARNING, AND THEN SAID 'MY PLANE.' HE DEVIATED, SO AS TO PASS ON THE R SIDE OF THE APCHING PLANE, TURNING L, AWAY FROM RWY 16R, AT ABOUT A HDG OF 360 DEGS. THE MISS WAS AT THE SAME ALT, AND THE MISS WAS LESS THAN 100 FT HORIZ, WINGTIP-TO-WINGTIP. (SEE ILLUSTRATION #3.) OUR FURTHER RECOVERY WAS MARRED AS A SMALL SINGLE ENG FIXED GEAR OF UNKNOWN TYPE WAS IN THE 'E' PATTERN, AND WAS CLRED TO LAND ON RWY 16L. (SEE ILLUSTRATION #4.) LATER CONVERSATIONS BTWN MY INSTRUCTOR AND THE TWR INDICATED THAT THIS SMALL TRAINING ACFT HAD OVERSHOT RWY 16L ON ITS BASE TO FINAL TURN, AND WAS HEADED MORE TOWARD RWY 16R. MY INSTRUCTOR AVOIDED THIS COLLISION BY TAKING EVASIVE ACTION TO THE L WITH APPROX A 500 FT DROP IN ALT DURING THE 180 DEG TURN. HE THEN CALLED THE TWR, AND GOT CLRNC TO LAND, AND THANKS FOR AVOIDING THIS. I DON'T FEEL COMFORTABLE ASSESSING ANY BLAME, BUT IT SEEMS TO ME THAT THERE ARE A LOT OF HUMAN FACTORS HERE WORTH DISCUSSING. FIRST, THE CTLR ASKED US TO KEEP BEST POSSIBLE SPD TO THE RWY WHEN THE OPPOSITE INSTRUCTION WAS WHAT WAS INTENDED, OR (THOUGH THE CTLR THOUGHT THIS NOT TO BE THE CASE IN LATER DISCUSSION) WAS ACTUALLY INTENDED FOR SOMEONE ALREADY ON FINAL. SECOND, WE WERE AWARE THAT THE CTLR'S WORKLOAD WAS EXTRAORDINARILY HIGH AND WE SHOULD HAVE ASKED FOR CLARIFICATION WHEN I FIRST WANTED TO GET IT. THIRD, THERE WERE TOO MANY PLANES IN THE PATTERN TO ALLOW FOR SAFE OPS, AND THE TOLERANCES FOR OVERSHOOT MAY BE TOO SLIM FOR VNY, AS RWY 16L IS USED FOR INITIAL FLT TRAINING OPS EXTENSIVELY, WHILE RWY 16R HAS A VARIETY OF TFC OF ALL SPDs AND PURPOSES. FOURTH, I THINK OUR INITIAL CORRECTION, THOUGH THE ONLY POSSIBILITY TO AVOID THE FIRST COLLISION, PUT US AT HIGH RISK TO INTERFERE WITH OTHER TFC. FIFTH, DURING THE COURSE OF THE 11.9 NM FROM INITIAL CALL IN, NO ONE ON 119.30 (THE TWR HAS A SECOND CTLR ON 120.20 FOR THE E PATTERN) HAD ANY TFC CALLOUTS. THEREFORE, NONE WERE CONFIRMED. SIXTH AND FINALLY, AS MINIMAL A FACTOR AS IT MAY SEEM, I BELIEVE THAT CALL BACKS OF SQUAWK CODES SHOULD NEVER BE OMITTED DUE TO BUSY RADIO AND TFC CONDITIONS. I THINK THE WHOLE PROB MAY HAVE ORIGINATED WHEN THE CTLR WAS LESS THAN SITUATIONALLY AWARE OF OUR POS AND GND SPD IN CONCORDANCE WITH THE STANDARD APCH WE WERE PLANNING TO MAKE. ONE LAST NOTE: THE CTLRS AT VNY DO A FANTASTIC JOB OF HANDLING MANY NEEDS IN A MIXED ENVIRONMENT. HUNDREDS OF STUDENTS COMBINED WITH SMALL TO MEDIUM SIZED BIZJETS VIE FOR THESE RWYS DAILY. PERHAPS THERE SHOULD BE SOME VOLUNTARY RESTRAINTS (LIKE NO TOUCH-AND-GOES ON THE WKENDS, OR A MAX AMOUNT OF TIMES IN THE PATTERN, OR A VARIATION IN THE 'E' PATTERN), TO HELP THEM DO THEIR JOB. THE CTLRS AT THE TWR HAVE GONE OUT OF THEIR WAY TO DO THINGS LIKE HOST PROGRAMS TO GET FAMILIAR WITH THE TWR (WHICH I HAVE ATTENDED), AND REALLY TAKE CARE OF THOSE WHO ARE SOLOING FOR THE FIRST TIME, ALONG WITH GETTING CLRNCs FOR THOSE WHO HAVE TO TRAVEL THROUGH THE BUSY LOS ANGELES CORRIDOR. REDUCING THEIR WORKLOAD WOULD KEEP EVERYTHING SAFER FOR EVERYONE.

Synopsis :

A STUDENT PLT RPT ON EXPERIENCING 2 NMAC'S ON 1 VISUAL APCH TO VNY, CA.

Time

Date : 199911

Day : Thu

Local Time Of Day : 1201 To 1800

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : TMB.Airport

State Reference : FL

Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 1000

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.Tower : TMB.Tower

Make Model : PA-28 Cherokee/Archer II/Dakota/Pillan/Warrior

Aircraft / 2

Controlling Facilities.Tower : TMB.Tower

Make Model : Cessna Twin Piston Undifferentiated or Other Model

Component / 1

Aircraft Component : FMS/FMC

Aircraft Reference : X

Problem : Design Deficiency

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 352

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 52

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 200

ASRS Report : 455867

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Person / 3

Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot

Person / 4

Function.Controller : Local

Events

Anomaly.Conflict : Airborne Critical

Anomaly.Conflict : NMAC

Anomaly.Non Adherence : FAR

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1

Resolutive Action.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action

Resolutive Action.Controller : Issued Advisory

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Airport

Problem Areas : Airspace Structure

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Problem Areas : Weather

Narrative :

WHILE WE WERE PARALLEL TO THE THRESHOLD OF RWY 9L WE RECEIVED A TA AT 11 O'CLOCK LNDG RWY 9L AS #1 AND WE SHOULD FOLLOW THAT ACFT. I ASKED THE CFI TWICE ABOUT THE TFC DUE TO OUR R BECAUSE I FELT THIS TO BE MORE A THREAT THAN THE OTHER LNDG TFC (AT THIS POINT IN TIME). INSTEAD OF WATCHING OUT FOR THE TFC, I REALIZED THAT HE STARTED AGAIN TO SET UP THE GPS/AUTOPLT FOR A DSCNT TO 500 FT, AND HAD HIS HANDS ON THE CTL YOKE, ATTEMPTING TO ENGAGE THE AUTOPLT (NOT SURE ABOUT IT -- MAYBE?). SECONDS LATER I SAW THE TWIN ENG PROP AT OUR 2 O'CLOCK POS FILLING THE R WINDOW AND CLOSING IN. THE HORIZ DISTANCE WAS, MAX, AROUND 300 FT. I SHOUTED 'MY CTLS, KEEP YOUR HANDS OFF' AND SIMULTANEOUSLY PUSHED THE YOKE DOWN AND LEFT DSNDING FAST AND EXCEEDING VNO, LEVELING OFF AT 500 FT THEN TURNING BACK TO A 270 DEG HDG. THE TWIN ACFT PROBABLY DIDN'T SEE US, AS WE WERE SLIGHTLY BELOW HIS GLIDE PATH AT ALL TIMES. HE OBVIOUSLY WAS IN A RUSH TO GET IN TO THE ARPT, MAYBE FOLLOWED BY A LATE HDOF FROM MIA APCH (MIA CLASS B AIRSPACE IN CLOSE VICINITY AND HE WAS PROBABLY ONLY LATE DSNDING AFTER TRANSITIONING THROUGH THE APCH PATH OF MIA). I WAS NOT SURE IF THE CFI HAD ENGAGED THE AUTOPLT AGAIN (NO CLR WARNING LIGHT IN THE VISUAL RANGE IN FRONT OF THE PLT, JUST LCD, HARD TO READ WITH SUN OR LIGHT REFLECTION IN THE COCKPIT) OR IF I JUST WAS 'OVERRIDING' THE CFI'S CTL MANUAL INPUTS ON THE YOKE (HE STILL HAD HIS HAND TIGHT ON IT) TRYING TO CONTINUE TO FLY STRAIGHT AND LEVEL. DUE TO THE STRONG XWIND WE WERE PUSHED RIGHT INTO THE APCH PATH FOR RWY 9L, SO I TURNED FURTHER R. THERE WAS SUBSTANTIAL CONFUSION WITH THE TWR ON THE RADIO FOLLOWING THIS EVENT. I SAW THE OTHER ACFT FOR RWY 9L ABOUT 3 MI AWAY. ATC ADVISED US TO TURN TO THE S AND WE WOULD BE #2 TO LAND. BUT THERE WAS NO OTHER ACFT IN BTWN US AND THE RWY 9L SO THE CFI RADIOED THAT WE ARE NOW #1 FOR FULL STOP. TWR ADVISED US TO CONTINUE DOWNWIND WHILE WE HAD ALREADY TURNED FINAL. WE THEN RECEIVED A LNDG CLRNC AND LANDED. WHEN WE HAD LEFT THE RWY WE HEARD ON THE RADIO THAT THE OTHER TFC BEHIND US WAS PERFORMING A GAR.

Synopsis :

NMAC BTWN A PIPER PA28-140 AND A TWIN CESSNA CONVERGING IN THE TMB TFC PATTERN AT 1000 FT. TWR CTLR HAD ISSUED TA.

Time

Date : 199912

Day : Thu

Local Time Of Day : 1201 To 1800

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : DAB.Airport

State Reference : FL

Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 300

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.Tower : DAB.Tower

Make Model : Cessna 152

Aircraft / 2

Controlling Facilities.Tower : DAB.Tower

Make Model : M-20 J (201)

Aircraft / 3

Controlling Facilities.Tower : DAB.Tower

Make Model : PA-34-200 Seneca I

Person / 1

Function.Oversight : PIC

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 900

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 75

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 300

ASRS Report : 456208

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Person / 3

Function.Oversight : PIC

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Person / 4

Function.Controller : Local

Person / 5

Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot

Events

Anomaly.Conflict : NMAC

Anomaly.Non Adherence : Clearance

Anomaly.Non Adherence : Required Legal Separation

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1

Resolatory Action.Flight Crew : Took Evasive Action

Resolatory Action.Controller : Separated Traffic

Supplementary

Problem Areas : ATC Human Performance

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

I WAS 'CLRED TO LAND' #2 BEHIND A SENECA. I WAS INSTRUCTED TO FOLLOW MY TFC. THE SENECA WAS CLRING THE RWY WHILE I WAS ON FINAL. ALL OF A SUDDEN, A MOONEY DSNDED FROM ABOVE AND CAME WITHIN 50 FT VERTLY OF HITTING MY ACFT. I ASSUMED CTL FROM MY STUDENT AND PUSHED THE NOSE DOWN. I EXCITEDLY TOLD ATC THAT A MOONEY WAS DSNding ON TOP OF US. THE CTLR SEEMED CONFUSED SINCE HE CALLED FOR A 'TWIN ON FINAL TO GO AROUND.' THERE WAS NO TWIN. I INFORMED HIM THE ACFT WAS A MOONEY AND FINALLY THE CALL WAS MADE. WE LANDED WITHOUT FURTHER INCIDENT. THE BEST GUESS MY STUDENT AND I CAN COME UP WITH AS TO THE CAUSE IS THE MOONEY TURNED AN EARLY BASE WITHOUT HAVING ME IN SIGHT. OUR CESSNA IS HIGH WINGED AND THE MOONEY IS LOW WINGED. THE BLIND SPOTS MADE IT HARD FOR BOTH OF US TO SEE EACH OTHER. ATC LOST SITUATIONAL AWARENESS AS TO THE LOCATION OF ACFT IN THE TFC PATTERN AND BECAME CONFUSED WHEN THE SIT OCCURRED.

Synopsis :

C152 AND MOONEY HAVE NMAC AT 300 FT ON FINAL AT DAB.

ACN: 456470

Time

Date : 199912

Day : Sat

Local Time Of Day : 1201 To 1800

Place

State Reference : MI

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 5000

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.TRACON : LAN.TRACON

Make Model : Baron 55/Cochise

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 2200

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 50

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 500

ASRS Report : 456470

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot

Person / 3

Function.Controller : Approach

Events

Anomaly.Other Spatial Deviation : Track Or Heading Deviation

Anomaly.Non Adherence : Clearance

Independent Detector.Other.ControllerA : 3

Resolatory Action.Flight Crew : Returned To Assigned Airspace

Resolatory Action.Controller : Issued Alert

Resolatory Action.Controller : Issued New Clearance

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

I WAS ASSIGNED A BLOCK OF SPACE BY LANSING APCH 5000-6000 FT AND 10 DME FROM JXN VOR. AT THE END OF THE PRACTICE, I ADVISED THE STUDENT TO DSND TO 5000 FT ON A HDG OF 090 DEGS AND CONTACT LANSING APCH TO REQUEST AN ILS RWY 24 AT JACKSON ARPT. DUE TO STRONG WESTERLY WINDS AND BEING BUSY HELPING THE STUDENT SET UP FOR THE APCH, THE ACFT DRIFTED TO 12 DME FROM JXN. THE CTLR ISSUED AN IMMEDIATE R TURN AND ADVISED THAT WE WERE ABOUT TO EXIT HIS AIRSPACE. I TOOK OVER THE CTL OF THE AIRPLANE AND REVERSED COURSE TOWARD JXN. THE CTLR STARTED VECTORING US FOR THE APCH, AND INDICATED THAT I WAS ASSIGNED A HDG OF 330 DEGS. I DID NOT HEAR THE CTLR GIVE ME SPECIFIC HDG. MY UNDERSTANDING WAS THAT I SHOULD IMMEDIATELY RETURN TO MY ASSIGNED BLOCK OF SPACE UNTIL I AM BEING VECTORED FOR THE APCH.

Synopsis :

BE55 INSTRUCTOR AND TRAINEE FLEW OUT OF ASSIGNED AIRSPACE.

Time

Date : 199912

Day : Sun

Local Time Of Day : 0601 To 1200

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : HOU.Airport

State Reference : TX

Altitude.AGL.Single Value : 0

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.Tower : HOU.Tower

Make Model : Cheetah Tiger Traveler

Aircraft / 2

Controlling Facilities.Tower : HOU.Tower

Make Model : B737 Undifferentiated or Other Model

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 1020

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 160

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 400

ASRS Report : 456480

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Person / 3

Function.Oversight : PIC

Function.Flight Crew : Captain

Person / 4

Function.Controller : Local

Person / 5

Function.Controller : Supervisor

Events

Anomaly.Conflict : Ground Critical

Anomaly.Non Adherence : Clearance

Independent Detector.Other.ControllerA : 4

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewB : 3

Resolatory Action.Flight Crew : Rejected Takeoff

Resolatory Action.Controller : Issued Alert

Consequence.FAA : Reviewed Incident With Flight Crew

Consequence.Other : Maintenance Action

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

I WAS ISSUED A TAXI INTO POS AND HOLD CLRNC FROM HOU TWR FOR RWY 30R. AT THE TIME TWR WAS ALSO WORKING GND CTL. I WAS TOLD TO POS AND HOLD AND EXPECT A WAKE TURB DELAY. AFTER WAITING 1 MIN, I DECIDED IT WAS SAFE TO WAIVE THE REMAINDER OF THE WAKE DELAY. I KEYED THE XMITTER AND SAID 'ACFT X WILL WAIVE THE REMAINDER OF WAKE DELAY.' AS I UNKEYED THE XMITTER I HEARD 'CLRED FOR TKOF, FLY RWY HDG.' NOT HEARING MY NUMBER, I KEYED THE MIKE AND SAID 'CLRED FOR TKOF RWY 30R, FLY RWY HDG ACFT X.' AFTER UNKEYING THE MIKE, I HEARD SILENCE, WHICH NORMALLY INDICATED THAT MY READBACK WAS CORRECT. AT THAT POINT, I INSTRUCTED MY STUDENT TO BEGIN THE TKOF ROLL. WE HAD TRAVELED APPROX 1000 FT DOWN THE RWY WHEN I LOOKED TO MY R AND SAW AN ACR B737 ROLLING ON RWY 22 AND HEARD 'ACFT X ABORT TKOF, ABORT, ABORT.' I TOOK CTL OF THE AIRPLANE AND BEGAN BRAKING. WE STOPPED APPROX 500 FT SHORT OF THE INTXN OF RWY 30R AND RWY 22. THE B737 ALSO INITIATED AN ABORTED TKOF ON HIS OWN. I CLRED THE RWY AND WAS TOLD THAT I DID NOT HAVE A TKOF CLRNC. THE B737 RETURNED TO HIS GATE TO HAVE HIS BRAKES INSPECTED BY MAINT AND THEN CONTINUED HIS FLT. UPON RETURNING FROM THE FLT, I CONTACTED THE TWR SUPVR TO DISCUSS THE INCIDENT. HE TOLD ME THAT MY TKOF CLRNC HAD PROBABLY BEEN PERFECTLY BLOCKED BY THE B737'S XMISSION FOR WHOM THE TKOF CLRNC WAS INTENDED. I TOOK AWAY A GREAT DEAL OF INFO FROM THIS INCIDENT AND LEARNED A LOT FROM IT. IN HINDSIGHT, I COULD HAVE DONE A BETTER JOB IN CLARIFYING MY TKOF CLRNC, AND BEEN MORE DILIGENT IN CLRING THE XING RWY. AND I SUPPOSE THAT THE TWR CTLR COULD HAVE CAUGHT MY TKOF ROLL EARLIER IF HE WAS NOT WORKING THE GND FREQ AT THE SAME TIME.

Synopsis :

BLOCKED XMISSIONS AT HOU RESULT IN 2 ACFT STARTING TKOF ROLL FROM INTERSECTING RWYS FOLLOWED BY A REJECTED TKOF BY BOTH ACFT.

Time

Date : 199912
Day : Fri
Local Time Of Day : 0601 To 1200

Place

State Reference : AZ
Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 200

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Make Model : Skyhawk 172/Cutlass 172

Aircraft / 2

Make Model : Skyhawk 172/Cutlass 172

Component / 1

Aircraft Component : Air/Ground Communication
Aircraft Reference : Y
Problem : Improperly Operated

Person / 1

Function.Oversight : PIC
Function.Instruction : Instructor
Experience.Flight Time.Total : 600
Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 100
Experience.Flight Time.Type : 180
ASRS Report : 457034

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Person / 3

Function.Oversight : PIC

Events

Anomaly.Other Spatial Deviation : Uncontrolled Traffic Pattern Deviation
Anomaly.Conflict : NMAC
Anomaly.Non Adherence : FAR
Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1
Resolatory Action.None Taken : Detected After The Fact

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Airport
Problem Areas : Chart Or Publication
Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

ON THE MORNING OF DEC/FRI/99, AT APPROX XA45 AM MST, A CESSNA 172 WAS INVOLVED IN AN NMAC WITH ANOTHER CESSNA 172 (UNKNOWN ACFT IDENT) DURING A TRAINING FLT AT THE BENSON MUNICIPAL ARPT (E95). DURING AN APCH TO LAND ON RWY 28 (WINDS WERE CALM), I HAD MY STUDENT INITIATE A GAR -- AS PART OF THE SYLLABUS REQUIREMENTS FOR THAT PARTICULAR LESSON. DURING THE UPWIND CLB, MY ATTN WAS INSIDE THE COCKPIT TEACHING MY STUDENT TO PROPERLY EXECUTE THE CLB WHILE 'CLEANING UP' THE ACFT. DURING OUR XWIND TURN, I LOOKED BACK TOWARDS THE RWY ONLY TO SEE A SECOND C172 APCHING TO LAND ON RWY 10. ALTHOUGH NOT 100% CERTAIN, IT IS MY BELIEF THAT THIS SECOND CESSNA ENTERED THE RWY 10 PATTERN STRAIGHT-IN FROM THE W. IT IS MY ESTIMATION THAT THE ACFT PASSED ONLY 50-100 FT BELOW US AT A HORIZ DISTANCE OF APPROX 300-400 FT. IT IS ALSO MY BELIEF THAT HAD WE NOT BEEN PRACTICING GAR PROCS, WE WOULD HAVE COLLIDED WITH THE OTHER ACFT EITHER ON THE RWY, OR DURING OUR UPWIND CLB. I BELIEVE THIS INCIDENT OCCURRED BECAUSE THE BENSON ARPT HAD ONLY RECENTLY OPENED TO THE PUBLIC, AND THE CTAF FREQ WAS, AT THE TIME, UNPUBLISHED. PRIOR TO OUR DEP, I WAS UNABLE TO FIND THE CTAF FREQ IN EITHER THE ARPT FACILITY DIRECTORY OR ON THE PHOENIX SECTIONAL. I THEN CONTACTED THE PRESCOTT FSS AND THEY INFORMED ME THAT THE CTAF FOR BENSON WAS 122.8. WHEN THIS INCIDENT OCCURRED, WE WERE MAKING ALL OF THE APPROPRIATE RADIO CALLS ON THIS FREQ. IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT ANOTHER ACFT, A MOONEY, WAS ALSO IN THE PATTERN FOR RWY 28, MAKING APPROPRIATE RADIO CALLS ON 122.8. THE UNKNOWN CESSNA, HOWEVER, EITHER MADE NO RADIO CALLS, OR WAS XMITTING ON ANOTHER FREQ. IN EITHER CASE, SUCH A PLT IS A THREAT TO ANY AND ALL OTHER ACFT SHARING THE SAME AIRSPACE. AFTER TOUCHDOWN, THE OTHER CESSNA QUICKLY DEPARTED THE ARPT TO THE NE, AGAIN MAKING NO RADIO CALLS. I BELIEVE THIS PROB CAN BE CORRECTED BY REQUIRING ALL UNCTLED ARPTS, ESPECIALLY NEW ONES, TO PAINT THE ARPT'S NAME, IDENTIFIER, AND FREQ ON THE PARALLEL TXWY WHEN POSSIBLE. THIS WOULD ALLOW PLTS TO QUICKLY IDENT AND VERIFY THIS INFO PRIOR TO ENTERING THE TFC PATTERN. WHEN NO TFC IS PRESENT, OR WHEN WIND/RWY ADVISORIES ARE UNAVAILABLE, I TEACH MY STUDENTS TO CROSS MID-FIELD OF AN UNCTLED ARPT 500-1000 FT ABOVE TFC PATTERN ALT TO VERIFY WIND DIRECTION. THE STUDENT CAN THEN DSND AND ENTER A STANDARD TFC PATTERN AT 45 DEGS TO THE DOWNWIND. WHILE STRAIGHT-IN LNDGS ARE CONVENIENT AND ARE SOMETIMES POSSIBLE WHEN NO OTHER TFC IS PRESENT, THEY ARE DANGEROUS WHEN OTHER ACFT ARE ESTABLISHED IN THE TFC PATTERN. I ALSO BELIEVE THAT AN ARPT SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO OPEN WITHOUT ARPT INFO FIRST APPEARING ON THE APPROPRIATE SECTIONAL AND/OR IN THE APPROPRIATE ARPT FACILITY DIRECTORY. I ALSO BELIEVE THAT LCL POLITICS WERE A FACTOR. I BELIEVE THAT LCL OFFICIALS WERE IN A RUSH TO OPEN THE ARPT TO KEEP PACE WITH THE RECENT OPENING OF NEARBY KARTCHNER CAVERNS.

Synopsis :

A C172 CFI AND STUDENT EXPERIENCE AN NMAC AT THE NEWLY OPENED E95 ARPT.

Time

Date : 199911
Day : Tue
Local Time Of Day : 0601 To 1200

Place

State Reference : AZ
Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 8500

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.ARTCC : ZAB.ARTCC
Controlling Facilities.TRACON : P50.TRACON
Make Model : Skylane 182/Rg Turbo Skylane/Rg

Component / 1

Aircraft Component : DME
Aircraft Reference : X
Problem : Not Installed

Component / 2

Aircraft Component : Loran
Aircraft Reference : X
Problem : Malfunctioning

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Instructor
Experience.Flight Time.Total : 988
Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 80
Experience.Flight Time.Type : 15
ASRS Report : 457580

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Person / 3

Function.Controller : Radar

Person / 4

Function.Controller : Approach

Events

Anomaly.Aircraft Equipment Problem : Less Severe
Anomaly.Airspace Violation : Entry
Anomaly.Non Adherence : FAR
Anomaly.Non Adherence : Published Procedure
Independent Detector.ATC Equipment.Other ATC Equipment : Radar
Independent Detector.Other.ControllerA : 4
Resolatory Action.None Taken : Detected After The Fact
Consequence.FAA : Reviewed Incident With Flight Crew

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Aircraft
Problem Areas : Airspace Structure
Problem Areas : ATC Human Performance
Problem Areas : Environmental Factor
Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

I WAS ON THIS FLT WITH A CUSTOMER WHO IS A PVT PLT WITH INST RATING. THE FLT BEGAN AT E14, DEST SEZ, VIA PHX. ONCE AIRBORNE, MY CUSTOMER OPENED HIS VFR FLT PLAN AND THEN ASKED ZAB FOR FLT FOLLOWING TO SEZ. ENRTE, ZAB ASKED US TO DEVIATE/ALTER OUR COURSE SLIGHTLY TO THE W TO AVOID E63 (ELOY ARPT -- THE LARGEST SKYDIVING ARPT IN AZ). WE COMPLIED. AT THAT TIME I WAS DEMONSTRATING TO THE PLT THE USE OF THE LORAN, SINCE WE HAD NO DME, WE WANTED TO KNOW OUR DISTANCE FROM PHX (PXR VOR) WITH THE LORAN. THE LORAN WASN'T COOPERATING WITH OUR INPUTS OF ARPTS AND WE WERE DISTR MOMENTARILY. AT THAT TIME, ZAB SAID TO US, IN A RAPID MANNER, TO SQUAWK VFR AND CONTACT PHX APCH (ON A SPECIFIC FREQ). WE IMMEDIATELY COMPLIED AND PHX APCH SAID 'RADAR CONTACT, YOU ARE IN CLASS B AIRSPACE, DON'T YOU KNOW YOU NEED A CLRNC TO ENTER CLASS B?' BECAUSE OF OUR ALT AND COURSE, WE HAD INADVERTENTLY CLIPPED THE BORDER OF CLASS B AIRSPACE. THEY CLRED US THROUGH CLASS B AIRSPACE AND GAVE US A NEW SQUAWK CODE. WE WERE DISTR WITH THE LORAN AND WE THOUGHT ZAB WOULD HAND US OFF TO PHX APCH OR, IF THEY WOULDN'T HAND US OFF, WE ASSUMED THEY WOULD HAVE GIVEN US PLENTY OF TIME PRIOR TO REACHING THE AIRSPACE FOR US TO HAVE CONTACTED PHX APCH. WE PLACED AN 'X' ON OUR SECTIONAL CHART WHERE WE APPROXIMATED ZAB'S HDOF (TO SQUAWK VFR) AND WE WERE IN CLASS B AIRSPACE WHILE ON FLT FOLLOWING WITH ZAB. IT IS THE PLT'S RESPONSIBILITY, THOUGH, TO ASSURE THAT THE PLT DOESN'T INCUR INTO CLASS B AIRSPACE. I THINK WE FELT TOO COMFORTABLE WITH ZAB THINKING THEY WOULD PROPERLY HAND US OFF AND I THINK THEY MOMENTARILY FORGOT ABOUT US OR THOUGHT WE WOULD HAVE ASKED FOR THE HDOF INSTEAD.

Synopsis :

A C182 CFI ENTERS THE CLASS B AIRSPACE OF PHX WHILE VECTORED AWAY FROM E63 BY ZAB. FLT WAS VFR FLT FOLLOWING AND HAD NO DME, JUST A MALFUNCTIONING LORAN.

Time

Date : 199912

Day : Sat

Local Time Of Day : 1201 To 1800

Place

State Reference : MD

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 4000

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.ARTCC : ZDC.ARTCC

Controlling Facilities.Tower : HGR.Tower

Make Model : PA-34-200 Seneca I

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 2450

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 90

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 60

ASRS Report : 457818

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Person / 3

Function.Controller : Radar

Person / 4

Function.Controller : Local

Events

Anomaly.Airspace Violation : Entry

Anomaly.Non Adherence : FAR

Independent Detector.ATC Equipment.Other ATC Equipment : Radar

Independent Detector.Other.ControllerA : 3

Resolatory Action.None Taken : Detected After The Fact

Consequence.FAA : Reviewed Incident With Flight Crew

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Chart Or Publication

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

AFTER COMPLETING AIRWORK TO THE E OF FDK ARPT, THE STUDENT AND I PROCEEDED TO FDK VOR. OUR PLAN WAS TO GO FROM THE FDK VOR TO HAGERSTOWN ARPT TO PRACTICE APCHS. BOTH THE GOV AND COMMERCIAL CHART APCH PLATES SHOW THE FDK 340 DEG RADIAL PASSING OUTSIDE PROHIBITED AIRSPACE P40 AND INTERSECTING THE HGR LOC AT NOLIN INTXN. THE STUDENT AND I TRACKED THE FDK 340 DEG RADIAL TO NOLIN AND UPON CONTACTING HAGERSTOWN TWR, WAS ADVISED BY THEM THAT ZDC REQUESTED WE CALL THEM FOR VIOLATING P40. NEEDLESS TO SAY, WE WERE QUITE SURPRISED SINCE THE STUDENT KEPT THE COURSE DEV INDICATOR CTRED AND BASED UPON THE APCH PLATES WHICH WE WERE USING TO NAV FROM FDK VOR THE HGR LOC, WE SHOULD HAVE REMAINED CLR OF P40. A CHK OF THE LAST VOR ACCURACY CHK SHOWED THAT THERE WAS ZERO ERROR ON THE VOR AIRBORNE EQUIP. WHEN WE LATER CALLED ZDC, THEY MENTIONED VIOLATIONS OF P40 ARE A COMMON OCCURRENCE. PERHAPS ONE REASON IS THE MISLEADING APCH PLATES. RECOMMEND FAA REVIEW THE GOV AND COMMERCIAL CHART APCH PLATES AND ENCOURAGE GOV AND COMMERCIAL CHART COMPANY TO CHANGE THEIR FORMAT TO MORE ACCURATELY REFLECT THE TRUE SIT, IE, THAT THE PDK 340 DEG RADIAL WILL TAKE YOU THROUGH P40.

Synopsis :

DURING INST TRAINING FLT, PROHIBITED AREA P40 WAS PENETRATED DUE TO FOLLOWING AN INTXN VOR RADIAL NOT INTENDED FOR INST FLT PLAN ROUTING.

ACN: 458100

Time

Date : 199912

Day : Sat

Local Time Of Day : 1201 To 1800

Place

State Reference : MD

Altitude.MSL.Single Value : 4000

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.ARTCC : ZDC.ARTCC

Controlling Facilities.Tower : HGR.Tower

Make Model : PA-34-200 Seneca I

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 600

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 300

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 8

ASRS Report : 458100

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Person / 3

Function.Controller : Local

Person / 4

Function.Controller : Radar

Events

Anomaly.Other Spatial Deviation : Track Or Heading Deviation

Anomaly.Airspace Violation : Entry

Anomaly.Non Adherence : FAR

Independent Detector.Other.ControllerA : 4

Resolatory Action.None Taken : Detected After The Fact

Consequence.FAA : Reviewed Incident With Flight Crew

Supplementary

Problem Areas : ATC Facility

Problem Areas : Chart Or Publication

Problem Areas : FAA

Narrative :

MY INSTRUCTOR AND I WERE FLYING ON THE 340 DEG RADIAL FROM FDK VOR TO INTERCEPT HAGERSTOWN'S LOC. ON BOTH THE GOV AND COMMERCIAL APCH PLATES THIS RADIAL SHOWS CLR OF P40 PROHIBITED AIRSPACE. UPON CONTACTING HAGERSTOWN TWR WE WERE TOLD THAT WASHINGTON CTR TRACKED US THROUGH P40 AND TO CONTACT THEM UPON LNDG. AFTER CONTACTING THEM WE WERE TOLD THAT WE WERE AS MUCH AS 2 MI INSIDE P40 AND THAT THIS WAS A COMMON PROB. I HAVE ENCLOSED COPIES OF BOTH THE GOV AND COMMERCIAL APCH PLATES FOR THE HAGERSTOWN ILS RWY 27 APCHES TO SHOW THAT THE 340 DEG RADIAL SHOWS CLR OF P40. OUR ACFT HAD A CURRENT VOR CHECK WITH A 0 DEG ERROR.

Synopsis :

A PA34 TRAINING FLT PENETRATES THE PROHIBITED AREA, P40, WHILE ON THE 340 DEG RADIAL OF FDK, MD. RPTR CITES CHARTING ERROR. P40 IS NOT PLACED CORRECTLY ON THE SUBJECT APCH CHARTS. THEY SHOULD DISPLAY THE 336 DEG RADIAL FOR STAYING W OF P40.

Time

Date : 200001

Day : Sun

Local Time Of Day : 0601 To 1200

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : SAN.Airport

State Reference : CA

Altitude.MSL.Bound Upper : 2500

Environment

Flight Conditions : VMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.TRACON : SCT.TRACON

Make Model : Skyhawk 172/Cutlass 172

Person / 1

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 1000

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 125

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 600

ASRS Report : 460150

Person / 2

Function.Instruction : Trainee

Person / 3

Function.Controller : Approach

Events

Anomaly.Airspace Violation : Entry

Anomaly.Non Adherence : FAR

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 2

Resolatory Action.None Taken : Detected After The Fact

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Airspace Structure

Problem Areas : Chart Or Publication

Problem Areas : Flight Crew Human Performance

Narrative :

ON A TRAINING MISSION WHILE PREPARING A STUDENT PLT FOR HIS CHK RIDE, I TOLD THE STUDENT TO INTERCEPT AND FLY THE 326 DEG RADIAL FROM MZB VORTAC. I ALSO TOLD THE STUDENT TO MAINTAIN 2500 FT MSL ALT. SINCE WE INTERCEPTED THE RADIAL JUST N OF MT SOLEDAD, AND FLEW OUTBOUND FROM THE MZB VORTAC, OUR FLT PATH CARRIED US THROUGH THE 'SEA WOLF' CORRIDOR OF CLASS B AIRSPACE FOR MIRAMAR MCAS. ALTHOUGH I AM COMPLETELY FAMILIAR WITH THE AIRSPACE, I COMPLETELY FORGOT ABOUT THAT SEGMENT OF THE CLASS B AND IT WASN'T UNTIL WE WERE N OF THE AREA THAT MY STUDENT POINTED OUT MY MISTAKE WHILE LOOKING AT THE SAN TERMINAL AREA CHART. THE FACT THAT THE FLT OCCURRED ON A SUNDAY, WHEN MIRAMAR MCAS IS USUALLY NOT BUSY, KEPT US FROM HAVING A CONFLICT WITH DEPARTING ACFT. THERE WAS NO EXCUSE FOR MY MISTAKE. I SIMPLY FORGOT WHERE OUR COURSE WOULD TAKE US. I WILL NOT MAKE THIS MISTAKE AGAIN.

Synopsis :

C172 ON TRAINING FLT ENTERS SAN CLASS B AIRSPACE WITHOUT CLRNC.

Time

Date : 200001

Day : Mon

Local Time Of Day : 1801 To 2400

Place

Locale Reference.Airport : ACV.Airport

State Reference : CA

Environment

Flight Conditions : IMC

Aircraft / 1

Controlling Facilities.ARTCC : ZSE.ARTCC

Make Model : Commercial Fixed Wing

Person / 1

Function.Oversight : PIC

Function.Instruction : Instructor

Function.Flight Crew : Single Pilot

Experience.Flight Time.Total : 450

Experience.Flight Time.Last 90 Days : 100

Experience.Flight Time.Type : 50

ASRS Report : 460767

Person / 2

Function.Controller : Radar

Events

Anomaly.Inflight Encounter : Weather

Anomaly.Non Adherence : Published Procedure

Independent Detector.Other.Flight CrewA : 1

Consequence.Other : Company Review

Situations

Aircraft.Make Model.Value : 998.00

Supplementary

Problem Areas : Airspace Structure

Problem Areas : ATC Human Performance

Problem Areas : Chart Or Publication

Narrative :

IAP CORRECTION -- SEATTLE CENTER CLEARS FOR APPROACH TO ACV, BUT NO SEATTLE CENTER FREQUENCY PRINTED ON APPROACH PLATE.

Synopsis :

SMA CFI AT ACV POINTS OUT LACK OF CURRENT INFORMATION 'PROPER FREQ' ON APCH CHART FOR ACV INSTRUMENT PROCEDURE.